CONCLUSION

All in all, I believe the procedure specified in this bill would enable the prompt and efficient establishment of appropriate tolerances for pesticide chemicals used in or on raw agricultural commodities. This would definitely be to the advantage of all concerned with the use of pesticide chemicals. The food consumer for the first time would be assured that a tolerance assuring safety has been established for every pesticide chemical used in the production and storage of the raw agricultural commodity. At the same time, chemical manufacturers would have standards upon which to base recommendations to the grower in the use of these chemicals, and the grower would not have his products confiscated because he did not know the tolerance for the various chemicals.

The grower would be assured that he would be in compliance with the law if he followed the recommendations of these agencies and of the manufacturer. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have a definite standard to carry on their enforcement responsibilities as regards to a safe food supply under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

In view of the urgency of this legislation and the expressed need for it, as well as the complete agreement, I sincerely hope early action will be given this bill.

The Need for Increasing the Salaries of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I honestly feel that the time has come when Congress should reappraise the schedule of salary payments made to postal employees with a view to adjusting these salaries so that they will be more in line with increases in the cost of living, continuing heavy tax burdens, and those other factors which have eroded the substance of postal employees' take-home pay.

In my opinion, no other group of Federal employees enjoys as long a history of service to our nation as the United States postal workers. There is no group of employees in or out of the Federal employees enjoys as long a history with greater pride to its record of steadfast, loyal, and efficient service to our nation. Unfortunately, too many people seem to take the loyalty and devotion to duty of our postal carriers for granted, just as they do so many other important factors that join to make the American way of life. I have been impressed deeply by the famous words so often used to personalize the postal service:

> Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these carriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

How many people have considered just what these words mean to us and to our country? Because of this loyalty and devotion, I feel that it is our responsibility in Congress to demonstrate to these employees that we recognize and appreciate their efforts and that every attempt will be made to see that they are treated as fairly as is possible.

I do not feel that it is necessary to discuss at length increases in the cost of living, increased taxes, reduced purchasing power of the dollar, or increased deductions for retirement; all of these facts are well known to us. But it is for other reasons also that I think an increase in salaries of postal employees is urgently required at this time.

Let us take, for example, the situation with regard to the increased productivity per worker in the Post Office Department. The type of activities engaged in by most of these employees is not too conducive to mechanization; because in sorting and handling mails and packages, it is still necessary for the human eye to differentiate between various names and addresses in order to assure that packages and letters are forwarded to their eventual destination with a minimum of delay. For this reason, any increase in the output per man-hour in the Post Office Department is largely the result of increased productivity on the part of these employees. During fiscal 1952, 49,740,510,000 pieces of mail were handled by the Post Office Department—the largest volume in any year of postal history. This was an increase of 6 per cent over the 1951 volume, and an increase of 32.9 per cent during the past 5-year period. While the volume of mail was increasing by over 30 per cent, the number of postal employees increased by slightly over 11 per cent in the years from 1947 through 1952, indicating that the output per man-hour must have increased considerably.

It should be remembered that production in a purely service institution of this kind is not as controllable as in many lines of business. The postal service does not choose its customers; it does not control the extent, time, or place that the patrons may hire its services. It cannot allow demands for its services to accumulate awaiting a time when facilities and personnel may render performance of duties under the most economical circumstances; neither can it stockpile productive effort to meet future increased or unusual demands. It must perform, with all possible speed and dispatch, when, where, and in whatever quantity the public chooses.

Among many little known facts about employees of the postal service, one is that it is necessary for them to study long hours at home on their own time in order that they may do their job more efficiently for the general benefit of everybody in our country. They must study changing schemes and transportation routing and destinations so that your mail may arrive more quickly at its appointed destination.

It would be possible to go into many more reasons for increasing postal salaries, but, unfortunately, our time here is limited. So, may I simply state my honest opinion on this matter. It is imperative that we in Congress enact pay raise legislation for postal employees as rapidly as possible to prove our trust in them; to reward them for their loyalty and devotion; to help them recoup a part of their losses resulting from increased prices and taxes, and decreased purchasing power of their take-home pay; to compensate their improved productivity; in short, because of the justice of the case made for such an increase in salary.

The Man Who Sentenced Beria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, can the man who sentenced Beria give us a clue to what might happen in Russia? Liquidation of the Bolshevik clique by the professional military?

Reports indicate Beria was sentenced to death by the man he made eat crow in 1945–46, General Konev, Soviet opposite number to Gen. Mark Clark, on the allied commission in Austria. Konev, proud, oldtime professional, took his orders from Zheltov, bullnecked Beria hatchetman in Vienna.

Konev, short, well liked by his troops, was friendly to the West. He didn't last long in Vienna. Zheltov saw to that. Then, the tables turned. Stalin died (?), Beria is tried. Konev sentences him. Where's Zheltov?

Does this mean that the professional military of Russia has had its fill of the crum-bums in the Kremlin? Does it spell a better break for the Russian, his wife and family—for all the men and women whose kin spilled blood in the hopes of a better tomorrow? One wonders. One hopes. One prays.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who knowest our frame and the frailties of our dust, we turn to Thee who alone canst fill our life with holy purpose. In the stillness of this hallowed moment we would bring to Thy altar the ancient sacrifice of an humble and a contrite heart. Breathe upon us, breath of God, with Thy quickening power restoring our souls, that we may feel a renewed sense of privilege as we enter upon the duties of yet another day.

We thank Thee for this new day, with all its precious possibilities, for its fleet-

ing hours waiting to be filled with honest labor; but especially we are grateful that it is an open door of golden opportunity to serve Thee, our Nation and our fear-haunted world. We pray that through the turmoil of life we may find Thy peace, that for all the challenges of life we may find Thy strength and in the adventure of death Thy rod and Thy staff in the shadow of the valley. We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

PAUL H. DOUGLAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, and IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from the State of New York, appeared in their seats today.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BENNETT thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 11, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the insertion of matters in the RECORD, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT ON INCLUSION OF ESCAPE CLAUSES IN EXISTING TRADE AGREEMENTS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.), I hereby submit to the Congress a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

This report was prepared for me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1954.*

(Enclosure: Report on trade agreement escape clauses.)

REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953, in accordance with section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), 79th Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1954.*

(Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from Frederick S. Hill, attorney at law, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Washington, D. C. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON FREEING THE INDIANS OF TEXAS FROM FEDERAL SUPERVISION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 108, a report of recommendations for such legislation as may be necessary to free the Indians in the State of Texas from Federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THOMAS BARRON *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, and Senate Resolution 216, 82d Congress, 1st session, a certified copy of that court's opinion entered in the case of *Thomas Barron* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALE OF POSTAGE-DUE STAMPS FOR PHILATELIC PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC., CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted at the 12th annual convention, National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, Inc., at Cleveland, Ohio, relating to the freedom of Poland, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT 12TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC., CLEVELAND, OHIO, OCTOBER 24, 1953

The convention of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent held on the 24th and 25th of October 1953, in Cleveland, Ohio, voted the following resolution:

"1. The National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent for 11 years has been active in behalf of the liberty and security of the United States, stronghold of democracy and rights of the free world threatened by Soviet Russia. Keeping in memory the heavy toll of American lives taken by the war against Germany and recently in Korea, the committee sees with deep concern the growing dangers threatening the future of the world and of this country. It is also with grave concern that the committee looks at the tragic fate of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain enslaved by communism, and particularly at that of Poland, the fatherland of our ancestors. The national committee wishes to express its deepest belief that there cannot be free and secure United States without Poland and other countries of Central and Eastern Europe enjoying freedom.

"2. Contrary to the pledges given last year during the election campaign, and contrary to the statement by President Dwight Eisenhower included in his declaration of February 2, 1953, the new administration did neither repudiate nor invalidate the Yalta Agreement. Contrary to the same pledges, the program of liberation of nations subjugated by Soviet Russia did not find any practical expression in the policy of the United States, and it is still limited to verbal declarations of the administration's representatives, who at the same time prepare a plan of nonaggression pacts with the Soviet Union. Under these circumstances we regret to state that the change of administration at the beginning of this year not only did not bring any improvement as far as our policy in respect to Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain is concerned, but there are grounds for fearing a further deterioration in that field. We feel regretfully obliged again to object to the

policy of our administration as we have been doing for the past 10 years in connection with the policy of the previous administration which was based on principles accepted at Yalta.

"3. We are strongly against any attempts at reaching agreement with the Soviet Union, which, after the death of Stalin, continues to constitute a menace to the free world's security and to that of our country. We warn that any temporary agreement with Russia will be used by her only to strengthen her military, economic, and political potential so as to better prepare for a final surprise attack against the free world.

"4. In accordance with the opinion which we have been expressing for over a decade, we consider that the only solution to the international situation lies in a steady and extensive strengthening of the United States of America as the foremost power capable to eliminate the Soviet Communist danger. The ultimate goal of American policy should be to take the initiative in her hands in order to liquidate Soviet terror and oppression and so to liberate the world and our own country from the constant threat of a Soviet aggression, and to liberate Poland and other subjugated countries from Moscow's oppression, thus restoring in the whole world the respect for the principles of freedom and democracy. The United States should accomplish this task even at the price of heavy sacrifices, since what is at stake is no less than the highest values of our civilization and culture, the liberty of the United States and of the whole world.

"5. Any attempts at solving those problems by restoring and rearming Germany not only are bound to fail, but also create a source of new dangerous complications hardly less serious than the Soviet danger. There are in the past history plenty of proofs that a restored German imperialism could not be expected to stop a prescribed limit but would again undertake plans of domination of Europe if not also other parts of the world, bringing new bloodshed and conflicts. The economic and political potential of Germany ought to be so limited as to enable her to take a suitable place in Europe on the basis of equality with other countries of that continent, but not to become a basis of a revised German imperialism. As Americans of Polish extraction we firmly oppose any tendencies aiming at restoring to Germany any part of Poland's western provinces which must be considered and remain an integral part of Polish territory.

"6. We express our strong protest against the persecution of the Catholic Church and other Christian denominations in Poland by a regime of foreign agents. In connection with the illegal demotion of the Primate of Poland, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, we denounce that act of Soviet terrorism perpetrated against the highest representative of the church's hierarchy in the enslaved country. We pay our highest tribute to the Polish people and their magnificent stand against their invaders. We appeal to the Polish people to remain calm and at the same time we appeal to the free world to raise a unanimous voice of protest against Soviet terrorism directed against its defenseless victims behind the Iron Curtain."

Henryk Liwacz, Chairman; Stefan Kozlowski, Secretary; Resolution Committee: Z. Dybowski, Cleveland, Ohio; E. Kleszczynski, New York, N. Y.; A. Szczepanik, Detroit, Mich.; A. Nabozny, Buffalo, N. Y.; T. Napiorkowski, Chicago, Ill.; A. Buczek, Philadelphia, Pa.; G. Rowinska, Jersey City, N. J.

The convention of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, held in Cleveland, Ohio, wishes to draw attention to certain anti-Polish activities in some American circles.

The book Poland: White Eagle on Red Field, by Samuel Sharp definitely falls into that category. The author of this book tendenciously and maliciously distorts Poland's past history as well as her present situation, while endeavoring to induce the policy of the United States of America to adopt toward Poland an attitude of complete detachment and indifference. The book was written by a Washington professor and published by the Harvard University; it was received approvingly and almost enthusiastically by the leading newspapers such as the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. These facts prove that there is nothing incidental in the publication of such a book in this country, a book which is devoid of any scholarly objectivity, which distorts well-known historical facts and endeavors to influence and mislead American opinion in a way definitely unfriendly to Poland, while at the same time purporting to represent the expression of scientific opinions of American scholarly circles.

We express our deep regrets that this anti-Polish, prejudiced, and hardly objective book was published by Harvard University, and warmly received by two leading papers.

The convention of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, held in Cleveland, Ohio, wishes to draw attention to an improper approach of certain American circles to the Polish problems and the Polish community.

Into that category falls the case of the creation by the National Committee for a Free Europe of a special commission for study and preparatory work for a future cooperation of the liberated countries of Central and Eastern Europe with a united Western Europe. Without consulting any of the Polish political responsible quarters, the National Committee invited an alleged Polish representative who, together with other similarly selected representatives of other East European countries, is presumed to deal with matters of vital importance for Poland and other countries of the above-mentioned area.

We consider such a method to be contrary to the principles of democracy and smacking of the methods used by Communists in imposing to the Polish people their alleged representatives without the consent of Polish independent political circles.

We strongly protest against such methods and we state that we consider them incompatible with the best American traditions. It is obvious that a body assembled in such a way can by no means represent the interests and opinions of the emigration circles of the subjugated countries. Thus nominated, the Polish representative in the above named commission has no right to represent the Polish interests and opinions.

Henryk Liwacz, Chairman; Stefan Kozlowski, Secretary; Resolution Committee: Z. Dybowski, Cleveland, Ohio; E. Kleszczynski, New York, N. Y.; A. Szczepanik, Detroit, Mich.; A. Nabozny, Buffalo, N. Y.; T. Napiorkowski, Chicago, Ill.; A. Buczek, Philadelphia, Pa.; G. Rowinska, Jersey City, N. J.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING CARDINAL WYSZYNSKI'S ARREST VOTED AT A PUBLIC MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

At a special session held on October 25, 1953, in Cleveland, Ohio, Americans of Polish descent and Poles in United States of America express their solemn protest against the act of terrorism committed on the primate of Poland, Stefan Wyszynski by the Communist regime in Poland. They also protest against the arrests and trials of Bishop Czeslaw Kaczmarek, Archbishop Eugeniusz Baziak, Archbishop Stanislaw Rospond, Bishop Stanislaw Adamski, Bishop Herbert Bednorz, Bishop Juliusz Bieniek, Bishop Lucjan Bernacki, and Bishop Antoni Baraniak.

The assembled protest before the free world against the persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland, against the arrests and sentences directed against the physical and spiritual freedom of the Catholic clergy in Poland.

Paying homage to the victims of Communist terror, we appeal to all Catholics in free countries, to the Catholic bishops and priests in the whole world, and particularly in United States of America, to all free men and women of any religion, asking them to raise a unanimous voice in protest against these religious persecutions.

Should such acts of terror and oppression remain unanswered, the atheistic rulers of Soviet Russia would see in it a proof of the passitivity and complacency of the Catholic world, remaining inactive in face of Soviet attempts at the destruction of the Catholic faith behind the Iron Curtain.

We solemnly warn against such a complacency. We firmly believe that the Catholics in this country and all its free citizens will undertake a unanimous campaign of mass protests, denouncing the acts of violence and terrorism committed by Soviet Russia and its subjugated countries.

The free world is directly threatened by Soviet aggression. Any agreements or pacts concluded with Soviet Russia, any abandonment of the great idea of liberation of peoples oppressed and terrorized by Communists in consequence of Yalta agreement, would be in flagrant contradiction with the spirit of the American tradition of freedom.

STEFAN SLIWINSKI,
Chairman.

PARITY FOR THE FARMER—RESOLUTIONS OF MERCHANTS OF KILLDEER, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the merchants of Killdeer, N. Dak., relating to parity for the farmer.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PARITY FOR THE FARMER," SAY TOWN BUSINESSMEN

Since the State of North Dakota is a major agricultural State, the businessmen of this city feel that it is most imperative that we work side by side with all those who are attempting to maintain a farm program which will enrich and develop the agricultural activities wherever they are a major industry or source of livelihood. In view of the above conclusion, the Killdeer merchants have adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we go on record condemning any effort on the part of any Congressman, the Department of Agriculture, or any agency for attempting to disrupt the present farm stabilization program, affecting all basic farm commodities.

"We further resolve that Congress shall not only maintain 90 percent of parity, but shall endeavor to establish 100 percent of parity for basic farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price support, but urge Congress to maintain a production control program which is essential in order to have stabilized price support.

"We further resolve to condemn any form of prosperity based on war and bloodshed, but favor a genuinely sane and sound economic program, particularly for the producer, which shall be based on industry, security, and individual initiative.

"We further urge all business groups in other cities of this State as well as those of other agricultural States to go on record favoring similar resolutions."

Killdeer Merchants: Roy A. Boomer, Manager, Motor Implement Co.; Mayme Patton, Kildeer Hotel; Bernard Kruckenberg; Fred Hollingsworth, Killdeer Drugs; Schmidt Standard Service; Hansen Implement; Clifford Wing, Wing Electric; Anton Wetsch, Wetsch Bros.; John J. Zimbrick, Zimbrick Department Store; Adamski Chevrolet Co.; Robert R. Rychmer; Glen Lawhead; Joseph J. Wetch, Variety and Confectionery; Douglas Swenson, Doug's Meat Market; Irene C. Trinka, Shannon Hotel; Peter Goetz, Occident Lumber Yard; Forest M. Gunwall, Manager, FU Oil Co.; Ed's Club; Marvin Holt, Occident Elevator; Victor H. Fraase; R. T. Dullum, Chuck Wagon; James Bank, Killdeer Willys Motors; Killdeer Milling Co.; Karey Motor Sales; Joseph Dolezal; M. E. Anderson; H. M. Weydahl; Ernest Churchenko, Ernie's Bar; Jerry Kadrmas; Geo. L. Grayson, Grayson Trucking; Jimmy Olynyk; Wolf & Weidner; E. S. Hoffman; Ambrose Stroh; Earl's Hardware; Pat Woods; Irene Stoll; Felix Dauenhauer, Hap's Bar; Patton Electric Service; Carl Anderson; Lloyd Dahl; Senester Anderson, all from Killdeer, N. Dak.

TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—RESOLUTION OF FOURTH STUDY CONFERENCE ON THE CHURCHES AND WORLD ORDER, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in October 1953 there was convened the Fourth National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order in Cleveland, Ohio.

I have before me the report of that conference, as published by the famed Department of International Justice and Goodwill of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

It is a pleasure to read this inspiring report. Included in it is the message of greeting by the President of the United States to Mrs. Douglas Horton, chairman of the National Study Conference.

Also included are quotations from the comments of the distinguished president of the National Council of Churches, Bishop William C. Martin, calling the conference together.

The resolutions adopted by the various sections of the conference are extremely stimulating and valuable. One such resolution which I should like to present to the Senate at this time relates to treaties and executive agreements. The resolution confirms the forthright position of leading churchmen in the United States in opposing any constitutional amendment which would hamper our Government amidst its present grave foreign-policy responsibilities.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The principle of cooperation and mutual concern implicit in the moral order and essential to a just and durable peace calls for a true community of nations. The United States can best insure its own peace and security by strengthening, and not weakening, the processes by which our Nation exercises its rightful influence within the family of nations.

The power of our Government to negotiate treaties and to make executive agreements should be so maintained as to insure (a) that the United States will not be hampered in taking expeditious and effective action in fulfilling our responsibility as a member of the world community of nations and (b) that the United States should be in a position to make its full contribution to the continuing development of international law and to bring international relations into greater harmony with the moral law. Convinced that adequate safeguards respecting the making of treaties and executive agreements are already provided, we express our opposition to any constitutional amendment which would hamper our Government in carrying forward and making effective a responsible foreign policy.

DEVELOPMENT OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS—RESOLUTION OF DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE, LA CROSSE, WIS.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Dairyland Power Cooperative concerning Federal Government policy as it relates to the development of hydroelectric projects, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE 12TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MEMBERS OF THE DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE HELD AT THE VOCATIONAL AND ADULT SCHOOL, LA CROSSE, WIS., ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1953

Whereas during these, the most critical times ever faced by our Nation, it is important to combat the insidious effects of communism not only on the international front but also here at home by preserving and building stronger the basic economic and political institutions upon which our country has been founded. To successfully resist Communist military attacks from without and Communist infiltration from within our democratic way of life must be fully nurtured and at the same time protected from private interests which are willing for purely selfish reasons to make inroads upon our democratic way of life under false propaganda and name calling in order to destroy and impede progress accomplished through democracy in action; and

Whereas it has always been the fundamental purpose of our democracy to have the Government assist the people in doing those things together which either could not be accomplished at all or not as well by the people acting individually, and through such governmental assistance it has been possible to accomplish the enviable record of the best standard of living for our people generally the world has ever known. In addition to our fine educational system, good roads, postal system, and public health the standard of living for whole segments of our population and geographical areas has been raised through such agencies as Rural Electrification Administration, and TVA in a system in which the Government has helped the people to help themselves on a dignified basis of self-liquidation of those projects; and

Whereas a vicious and well-subsidized propaganda program is being carried on today which through the use of a debased name-calling scheme labels such outstanding accomplishments as "creeping socialism" all for the purpose of attempting to acquire monopolistic control of the remaining natural resources with an electric power potentiality, and to prevent electric cooperatives from generating their own power or buying power at cost from Government dams: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates to Dairyland Power Cooperative in its 1953 annual meeting assembled, go on record as urging the Congress—

1. To proceed in developing the natural resources of the country in a manner calculated to aid and benefit all the people by developing available water power projects in such manner as to obtain maximum benefits from flood control, soil conservation, and the development of low cost power.

2. That such developments be made upon the basis of the overall river basin development with the reservoirs capacity constructed at public expense utilizing Government power projects from which revenue can be obtained to properly contribute to defraying the expense.

3. That to permit construction of private profit power projects as parasites upon the reservoirs capacity investment of the Government is atrocious.

4. That to force sales of the electricity at the dam to a single purchaser at forced prices of whatever the monopolistic purchaser will pay is a surrender of the people's rights to have the electricity made available by the Government at places where the people need it and where the Government can obtain a full and fair price through the action of the demands of diverse users.

5. That for the Government to fail to build all necessary transmission lines to market the power is analogous to turning all bridges over to private companies to take whatever toll they wish to tax upon the public road system; and be it finally

Resolved, That the secretary be and the same is hereby authorized and instructed to send a copy of this resolution (1) to each of the dairyland member distribution cooperatives, and (2) to each Senator and Congressman representing the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois in which Dairyland Power Cooperative operates.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2671. A bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland):

S. 2672. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2673. A bill for the relief of Frank M. S. Shu; and

S. 2674. A bill for the relief of Moxon J. van den Abeele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 2675. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shoreline of the State of Connecticut from the Housatonic River to Ash Creek; and

S. 2676. A bill to authorize beach erosion control of the shoreline of the State of Connecticut from New Haven Harbor to the

Housatonic River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

S. 2677. A bill for the relief of Michio Yamamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2678. A bill for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2679. A bill for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski Memorial Day for observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 114) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, introduced by Mr. Saltonstall, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, under the terms of the joint resolution, the President would be directed to call upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on that day and to invite the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches. Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski died on October 11, 1779, from wounds received 2 days earlier at the siege of Savannah, Ga., in the Revolutionary War.

It is especially fitting that we should commemorate the death of this great soldier for freedom. He was a true patriot, both of the newly created United States and of his native land of Poland. That land today suffers under Communist enslavement, and his memory is an inspiration to those who keep alive the spirit of freedom not only in Poland but in all the other oppressed countries behind the Iron Curtain.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 184), which was placed on the calendar:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsections (g) (1) (B) and (2) (C) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed the unexpended balance of the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 56, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on February 20, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

EMPLOYMENT OF TWO CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations an original resolution, Senate Resolution 179, continuing the authority of the committee to employ two additional clerical assistants. The resolution was placed on the calendar, but it should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ANSWERS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE FARM PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has prepared a set of questions and answers on the new farm program recommendations embodied in the President's message of yesterday to the Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have these questions and answers printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 1954.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON NEW FARM PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

Following is a series of questions and answers which give information on the chief provisions of new farm program recommendations covered in a special message to the Congress from President Eisenhower on January 11, 1954:

Question. Why is a new farm program needed?

Answer. Because the present farm program is proving unworkable. Huge surpluses are mounting steadily. At the same time, farm purchasing power has dropped in spite of aggressive application of price-support laws now on the books.

The Commodity Credit Corporation's investments in surplus commodities have more than doubled in the past year alone. Jumping from $2 billion in October 1952, to $4.5 billion in October 1953, the CCC's financial obligations now are pressing hard against the $6.75 billion limitation of its borrowing power.

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas have spread to wheat and cotton for the 1954 crops. Acreage allotments for corn seem certain. And millions of acres diverted from these crops can be expected to cause serious trouble with the supplies of other crops.

But even with the application of price-support programs, farm income has gone down. Thus a new program—an improved program—is needed.

Question. Is the new program entirely different?

Answer. There are a number of new features. But in general, the program would retain successful features of past programs, strengthen others, and replace the least successful portions.

Question. What are the most important features of the new program?

Answer. These features stand out:

A flexible (rather than rigid) price-support program, adjustable according to the supply of the respective commodities.

A modernized parity formula, permitting the price-support program to reflect the ever-changing pattern of farm costs as farming methods are improved.

A "freezing" of excess commodity reserves, isolating these stocks for emergency use, and other uses outside regular channels, thus preventing them from having a depressing effect on the market or handicapping the new program with burdensome stocks accumulated under present high rigid price supports.

High level trade missions and a conference with ministers of agriculture and food of other countries to discuss the stabilization of prices for farm products moving in international trade and the utilization of accumulating supplies of food and fiber.

An increase in the Commodity Credit Corporation's borrowing authority to $8.5 billion to cover present price-support commitments for 1954 crops.

In addition, the program would provide an entirely new program for wool. It would continue virtually unchanged the programs for tobacco, meat animals, dairy products, poultry and eggs, fruits and vegetables, sugar, and feed grains other than corn. Except for tobacco, the basic commodities would be placed under the adjustable provisions of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949. Potato growers would be given the same price-support assistance as the growers of other fruit and vegetables, on a permissive basis. And mandatory price supports would be discontinued for tung nuts and honey, which would be placed in the category for which price supports are permissive.

Question. What is the new program designed to do?

Answer. These are some of the goals:

Protect farm prices and income.

Avoid building up burdensome surpluses.

Give farmers freedom to increase efficiency and adjust production to changing consumer demand.

Enable consumers to buy food and other farm products at prices reflecting available supplies.

Allow American agriculture to operate on a flexible, rather than a rigid basis.

Minimize the problem of diverted acres and production curbs.

Restore the rewards for good farm management to those who earn them.

Increase incentives to conserve and improve the soil.

Provide long-range planning for efficient production and marketing.

Open new markets both at home and abroad.

Improve international relationships.

Question. How was the new program worked out?

Answer. Through the most thorough study of farm problems and governmental programs ever undertaken. Participating in the study were congressional committees, the farm organization, the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, the departmental agencies, scores of producer, processor, and trade groups, the agricultural colleges, 500 of the best qualified and best known agricultural men in the country, and countless individual farmers and interested citizens.

Question. What are the advantages of flexible price supports?

Answer. They are the only type of supports which promote shifts in production and supply to meet changes in demand. They do this by allowing for modest price fluctuations which provide incentives for farmers to adjust their production. The present system of rigid supports, in contrast, perpetuates surpluses and unbalanced production. It also results in lower farm income when artificially high prices result in lost markets. Flexible supports, on the other hand, can produce larger income because they permit larger production—farm income being the product of units sold multiplied by the price received.

Question. How would flexible supports operate?

Answer. They would operate as set forth in the agricultural acts of 1948 and 1949. Under this law—which was amended to postpone the flexibility features from becoming effective until 1955—the level of price support on basic commodities would vary between 75 and 90 percent of parity, depending on the level of supply. Here is what the act provides:

"Support shall be at levels not in excess of 90 percent of the parity price and for some products not less than the levels called for by a minimum support schedule ranging from 75 to 90 percent of the parity price, according to the relationship of total supply to normal supply.

"That minimum support schedule in general declines 1 percent for every 2 percent increase in the total supply. If the supply is abundant, a lowered price stimulates consumption and discourages production. If the supply is short, an increased price support level encourages production. Fluctuation in price and supply tend to offset one another, and to stabilize income."

Question. What are the advantages of the modernized parity formula?

Answer. It permits parity to reflect changes in farm costs as farming methods are improved. It also takes account of the consequences of changing trends in demand for different farm commodities and products.

Question. What effect would the modernized parity formula have?

Answer. First, it would place all price-supported farm commodities on a fair basis, ending the present situation in which some commodities come under the new parity calculation while others are exempt. The basic commodities are exempt until 1956, their computations being based either on the old or new formula, whichever is higher. The old formula is based on the conditions of the 1909–14 period and does not allow for increased production efficiency or changes in consumer demand. The modernized formula is based on a progressive 10-year average.

Second, it would provide support for all commodities at a realistic level, in keeping with present-day conditions. For example, in 1950 it took wheat farmers an average of only 26 hours to produce a hundred bushels of wheat as compared with 106 hours in 1910–14. Thus parity for wheat under the new formula is 15 percent lower than under the old. For peanuts parity is 23 percent lower. For corn it is 10 percent lower. And for cotton it is 4 percent lower.

Question. How would the changeover to the new formula be made?

Answer. The exemption from the modernized parity formula now granted the basic commodities would be allowed to expire as scheduled on January 1, 1956. Following this, the changeover would be made gradually by dropping the parity level not more than 5 percent per year until the new formula is completely in effect.

Question. What are excess reserves?

Answer. Excess reserves are the surplus farm commodities left over after the Nation's normal reserve needs have been filled. The normal reserve includes sizable quantities of some farm products for use in the event of war, drought, famine relief, and other domestic and foreign-aid programs. When these needs have been filled reserve supplies still on hand are designated excess reserves.

Question. What would freezing excess reserves accomplish?

Answer. It would isolate present excess reserves of wheat, cotton, vegetable oils, and possibly dairy products from the market in order to give the new program a chance to work.

The farm problem today is not so much one of overproduction as it is a problem of unbalanced production. It is this problem which the new farm program is designed to solve. However, it cannot be expected to work effectively if excess reserves of various commodities are allowed to hang over the market where their presence would have the effect of depressing prices or necessitating too much of a decline in the level of price supports.

Question. How would the freezing be accomplished?

Answer. It is recommended that up to $2.5 billion be used for the setting aside of reserves from present CCC stocks. Deterioration and loss of quality would be held to a minimum through rotating stocks where necessary.

Question. How would frozen stocks be moved?

Answer. Broad discretionary authority would be granted the President and Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of the commodities in a way that would not disturb normal trade. Likely outlets would be foreign aid, new foreign markets, barter, and disaster and famine relief.

Question. Why should CCC's borrowing authority be increased?

Answer. Because its financial obligations are now pressing hard against the $6.75 billion limitation on its borrowing authority. An additional authorization to $8.5 billion is necessary to cover price-support commitments for 1954 crops alone.

Question. How would the new program affect major farm commodities?

Answer. Wheat: The provisions of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949 would apply, with the price-support level to depend upon supply. The computation of parity for wheat would be modernized beginning January 1, 1956.

The authority for acreage allotments and marketing quotas would be continued, but lower support levels would take away some of the incentive to grow wheat on land better suited for pasture or other crops. It would also open new market outlets. There would be less need to restrict production as the Nation moved away from fixed supports at 90 percent of the old parity.

It is recommended that a sizable portion of the wheat surplus be frozen. This reserve would not be considered as part of the total supply used in determining price support levels and acreage allotments.

Cotton: Price supports between 75 and 90 percent of parity, dependent upon supply, would go into effect as set forth in the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949. Modernized parity would become effective as scheduled on January 1, 1956, the difference involved being less than 4 percent.

Under the proposed program, Congress would repeal the provisions which require that production controls be fully applied before there can be any reduction of the price-support level.

A part of the cotton carryover now in prospect would be frozen effective January 1, 1955. The new program could then become operative without the burden of the present excess reserves.

Corn: Support would range from 75 to 90 percent of parity, according to the relationship of total supply to normal supply. Under the 1948–49 law the level of price support would drop 1 percent for each 2 percent increase in supply.

Under the proposed program, Congress would take several steps to amend existing legislation. One would prevent a decline of more than 5 percent in the support price on corn in any single year as a result of the transition from the old to the new parity formula. Another would provide that the Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective as scheduled for the corn crop of 1955 and subsequent crops. A third would provide a decrease of 1 percent in support price for each 1 percent increase in supply, instead of 1 percent for each 2 percent increase in supply. This change would give greater flexibility to corn support prices and help prevent the building up of surpluses. A fourth legislative change would raise the normal carryover allowance for corn from the present level of 10 percent to 15 percent of domestic disappearance plus exports. A fifth would make the modernized parity formula effective January 1, 1956. And a sixth would suspend requirements for marketing quotas on corn because they cannot be effectively enforced.

Corn stocks would not be frozen. Since there is little hope for a substantial export market for corn, our large stocks can be used as feed for livestock and poultry and our growing population.

Other feed grains: The present program would be continued for oats, barley, and grain sorghum. The Agricultural Act of 1949 authorizes price support for these nonbasic crops at not to exceed 90 percent of parity. The amounts, terms, and conditions of price support operations and the extent of such operations is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Wool: An entirely new program is recommended for wool. Under it, domestically produced wool prices would be permitted to seek their own level in the market, competing directly with other fibers and with imported wool. Then domestic producers would receive direct payments.

These would equal the difference between the average market price for the season and 90 percent of parity. In other words, these payments, when added to the average market price for the season, would raise the average return per pound to 90 percent of parity. Each producer would receive the same support payment per pound of wool, no matter how much he received for his wool in the market place. This would allow each grower his reward for efficient production and marketing.

This system would not require Government loans, purchases, storage, or any other interference with the market. Funds for the direct payments would come from the general revenue within the amount of unobligated tariff receipts on wool.

Meat animals, dairy products, and poultry and eggs: Present price-support legislation would be continued for all these products.

Support for meat animals is authorized at levels not to succeed 90 percent of parity. Such support is permissive, not mandatory. The same is true for poultry and eggs.

Price support for dairy products is mandatory between 75 and 90 percent of parity. In addition to continuing such support, a part of the carryover might be frozen.

Peanuts: The Agricultural Act of 1949 would become effective January 1, 1955, to permit price adjustments when the supply changes. In addition, modernized parity would become effective for peanuts beginning January 1, 1956, as now scheduled. A transitional provision also would be provided which would limit the decrease from the old parity to not more than 5 percent per year. The old parity is 23 percent higher than the new parity.

Tobacco: The price-support program for this commodity would be continued in substantially its present form. The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.

This program is being continued because producers and processors are generally satisfied with it and tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government.

Rice: Mandatory price support at 90 percent of parity would be allowed to expire for rice after the 1954 crop. With the supply situation as it is now estimated, the 1955 crop would probably be supported at about 90 percent of parity.

Although no difficulty has been experienced in supporting the price of this crop, the time to make a change is before trouble occurs. Mandatory supports at 90 percent of parity could prevent an adjustment for rice, if one should be needed, just as they prevented the adjustment for wheat, when it was needed.

Oil seeds: The provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 would apply for soybeans, cottonseed, and flax. Price support is authorized at not to exceed 90 percent of the parity price. In addition to continuing such support, the new program would freeze a large quantity of vegetable oils, effective January 1, 1955. It is estimated that at that time the surplus will be over 1 billion pounds valued at about $200 million.

Fruits and vegetables: Present provisions for the use of section 32 funds in behalf of fruits and vegetables would be continued. These funds taken from tariff receipts are used in case of market distress for limited purchases of market surpluses, for diverting products from normal marketing channels or into export outlets, and for similar purposes.

Marketing agreements also would be continued, but would be liberalized in several ways: First, to include additional commodities to which marketing agreements are suitable. Second, to enlarge and clarify the authorization for agencies established under marketing orders to engage in or finance, within reasonable limits, research work from funds collected under the marketing order.

Third, to provide for the continuous operation of marketing agreements, despite short-term price fluctuations, where necessary to assure orderly distribution throughout the marketing season. And fourth, to obtain congressional approval for enlarging and clarifying the authorization for the use of marketing orders to promote marketing efficiency, including the regulation of containers and types of pack for fresh fruits and vegetables.

In addition, the new program would also require legislation to allow assistance to potato growers in the same manner as is available for producers of other fruits and vegetables. All price-support assistance to potato growers was removed several years ago when difficulties arose involving much waste and expense. The new proposal would not restore the old program, but would simply give potato growers the same type of assistance that is available to other producers of fruits and vegetables.

Sugar: The sugar program would be continued in essentially its present form. The Sugar Act was extended in 1951 by unanimous vote in the House of Representatives and by a 72-to-4 vote in the Senate.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF FOUNDING OF CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the unfinished business is Senate bill 987, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass. So far as I know, there is no objection to the bill. Because I must preside at a committee meeting early this afternoon, I ask the Senator from Delaware if he will permit the Senate to take action on the bill at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am glad to accommodate the Senator from Massachusetts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "exceed", to insert "one million."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 1, after the word "coinage", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces coined shall not be less than one hundred thousand."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the word "coins", to strike out "Not less than five thousand such coins shall be issued at any one time, and no such coins shall be issued after ————."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, at the beginning of line 5, it is proposed to strike out "1953" and insert in lieu thereof "1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., to be held in June 1954, there shall be coined not to exceed 1 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for such coinage: *Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces coined shall not be less than 100,000.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1954, shall be legal tender to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the city of Northampton, Mass., or its duly authorized agent, upon the payment by it of the par value of such coins. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium, and the net proceeds from the disposition of such coins shall be used for such purposes related to the observance of such tercentennial celebration as the city of Northampton, Mass., shall direct.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the processes of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall so far as applicable apply to the coinage herein authorized.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a statement which I have had prepared relating to the bill just passed by the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On February 18, 1953, I introduced S. 987, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

This bill is to celebrate the tercentenary of Northampton, Mass., which is one of our fine and old industrial communities. It is also a fine residential community. It received its charter as a city in 1654, when there were probably less than 75,000 settlers in the New World.

Northampton is the home of Smith College for Women, which is famous throughout our Nation. It was established in 1875, and until very recently was the largest college for women in the world. Smith College was selected by the Navy Department as the site for its WAVES Officer Training School.

Northampton is the home of Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, widow of our 30th President. Clarke School for the Deaf, founded by John Clarke, a Northampton citizen, is known all over the world due to the fact it teaches lip-reading exclusively. Mrs. Coolidge once taught in Clarke School and was later president of its board of trustees.

One of the oldest newspapers in the country with continuous circulation—the Hampshire Gazette—was established in Northampton in 1786.

Northampton is a city of many fine public parks. It has an outstanding library—Forbes Library—containing over 250,000 volumes, which in point of size among city libraries ranks 4th in Massachusetts, and 40th among the 7,000 libraries in the United States, a fact which is a striking tribute to the cultural traditions of this comparatively small community.

Northampton has been the cradle of many outstanding Americans throughout the years. It has produced 1 President of the United States, 1 Vice President, and a grandson of a Northampton citizen became Vice

President. Four members of Presidential Cabinets, 4 United States Senators, 3 Congressmen, 2 Governors of the Commonwealth, and 9 attorneys who were appointed to either the supreme or superior court were all residents of Northampton.

Calvin Coolidge was 29th Vice President and 30th President of the United States. Franklin Pierce, 14th President of the country, received his legal education in Northampton at a law school established by Judge Samuel Howe and Senator Elijah H. Mills. Aaron Burr, the third Vice President of the United States, was a grandson of the Reverend Jonathan Edwards, a noted preacher of Northampton.

The four United States Senators from Northampton were Caleb Strong, Eli P. Ashmun, Elijah H. Mills, and Isaac Bates.

Elijah H. Mills, Isaac C. Bates, and Charles Delano were Congressmen from Northampton to the United States House of Representatives.

Caleb Strong served as Governor of Massachusetts for 12 years—from 1800 to 1807 and again from 1812 to 1816. Calvin Coolidge served both as Lieutenant Governor and Governor of the Commonwealth.

The Marquis de Lafayette, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Jenny Lind, Oliver Wendell Holmes, William Lloyd Garrison, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Horace Greely, Wendell Phillips, P. T. Barnum—to mention only a few—were among the many distinguished visitors to Northampton. President McKinley visited the city in the early 1900's.

The U. S. S. *Northampton*, now on active duty, is the second cruiser to be named for this Massachusetts community.

I believe it very fitting that the tercentenary of this fine Massachusetts city should be commemorated by the 50-cent pieces which are authorized in S. 987.

STRANGE IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION OF FRANK CAMMARATA

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have called the attention of the Senate to the strange immunity from prosecution which certain members of the underworld had under the previous regime of the Treasury Department.

Among those enjoying this special protection were such notorious characters as Frank Costello, Ralph Capone, the members of their gangs, along with many others of the country's most dangerous criminals.

The record, as documented at that time, plainly showed that these gangsters were not being made to pay their taxes, nor was there any serious attempt being made to prosecute them. Their criminal cases were pigeonholed and their tax liabilities settled for an insignificant fraction of the assessment.

Today I shall outline another case which, if possible, is an even more disgusting example of gangster coddling.

In this instance the racketeer was caught in a clear-cut violation of our Federal income-tax laws. For a period of 7 years, 1939 to 1946, he admitted having willfully failed either to file his returns or to pay any Federal income tax.

This case, involving Frank Cammarata, alias Sam Commarata, alias Sam Morecia, alias Frank Camarati, FBI No. 9739, was reported to the Treasury Department, and their attention was called to the fact that the individual involved was a dangerous criminal.

Upon receiving this information the Treasury Department ordered an investigation, and the agents' report confirmed the fact that Frank Cammarata did willfully fail to pay any income taxes for the period 1939 to 1946.

What happened? He was allowed to file belated tax returns for the 7 years involved. His case was dropped and there is no record of any effort being made to bring criminal prosecution against this notorious racketeer. Furthermore, as of today there is no criminal action pending by the Treasury Department.

There are, however, two civil cases in the Tax Court against Frank Cammarata for the years 1949 and 1950 in the amounts of $5,916.64 and $3,334.68, respectively, but still no evidence of any criminal prosecution. The fact that these two civil cases are pending merely shows that even after having successfully fixed his tax obligations for the 1939–46 period he still did not recognize his responsibility to pay taxes as is required of the average American citizen.

Of course, that attitude is easily understood in the light of his past experience with the Treasury Department.

The following is a chronological record of this case, along with a background of the racketeer involved.

The police files show that Frank Cammarata's operations extended throughout several Midwestern States, centering principally in the Michigan area.

Frank Cammarata, in addition to having a rather notorious criminal record of his own, is also listed in the police files of Youngstown, Ohio, as being a brother-in-law of the notorious Pete Licavoli, the reputed head of the Detroit Purple Gang. The police record of his brother-in-law contains 3 charges of armed robbery, 2 involving kidnapping, and 3 charges of murder.

Frank Cammarata was also charged with illegal entry into this country.

He was convicted of bank robbery in Detroit in 1931 and was sentenced to 15 to 30 years in the Michigan State Penitentiary.

The Bureau of Immigration then took cognizance of the fact that Frank Cammarata was not a desirable American citizen and deportation proceedings were instituted. He was paroled December 16, 1936, by the Michigan authorities for the purpose of being deported back to Sicily.

In 1946 the Immigration authorities discovered that shortly after his deportation, Frank Cammarata had, some time during 1939, been smuggled back into this country and that he had been hiding out in Ohio.

The Michigan State authorities sought to have Mr. Cammarata brought back to that State as a parole violator to serve the remainder of his sentence. The Immigration Bureau likewise brought charges of illegal entry against this racketeer and again asked for his deportation as an undesirable alien.

The efforts of the Immigration Bureau to deport this criminal were blocked, however, by the introduction in Congress of three different bills, the purpose of which was to delay deportation proceedings and to give protection to Frank Cammarata.

Those three private bills were as follows: H. R. 6286, introduced April 20, 1948; S. 2587, introduced April 30, 1948; H. R. 3890, introduced March 29, 1949.

Thus we find at this point the following situation:

The State of Michigan was attempting to have Frank Cammarata brought back from Ohio for the purpose of serving the remainder of his sentence as a parole violator. This action by the Michigan authorities was being contested and delayed in the Ohio courts by Mr. Cammarata. The Immigration authorities had been stopped in their effort to deport this undesirable character by the introduction of the three private bills referred to above.

It was at this point that the Treasury Department moved in.

An investigation soon developed the fact that during the interval between 1939, the date when Frank Cammarata was smuggled back into this country, until his discovery by the Immigration authorities in 1946 he had failed either to pay or to file any income-tax reports.

It should be noted that the failure of a racketeer to file proper income tax returns has always been considered as one medium whereby the Federal authorities could prosecute these undesirable characters. However, in this instance rather than take advantage of an opportunity to remove this man from decent society, the Treasury Department allowed this gangster to file belated tax returns for each of the years involved and dropped all efforts for prosecution.

Just who in the Treasury Department is responsible for this extreme leniency to another racketeer is a question which thus far I have been unable to obtain; however, it is one to which the American people should be given an answer.

I have been advised by the Treasury Department that due to the fact that I do not have any official committee status, section 55 would preclude their giving me information regarding this member of the underworld.

I do find, however, that the Michigan State authorities on July 2, 1953, were finally successful in their effort to have Mr. Cammarata brought back to Michigan where he is presently serving the remainder of his previous term. However, it should be noted that Frank Cammarata is in jail today in spite of and not as the result of any action taken by the United States authorities.

Thus far I have been unable to find any explanation whatever for the reason that the Treasury Department in 1948 deliberately gave this whitewash to the 8-year tax delinquency of a notorious criminal, particularly when that racketeer was during the period involved living in our country illegally.

I do know this much, however, such leniency was not extended by the same authorities to the average American citizen.

I have been advised that the Department of Justice now has an outstanding deportation warrant lodged with the Michigan authorities as a detainer to be executed at the time Frank Cammarata is released from prison.

I know of no better way to express my opinion of the Treasury Department's handling of this case than to quote Mr. Edward J. Allen, former chief of police, Youngstown, Ohio:

It would be interesting to learn how such a character who has shown nothing but contempt for our laws, and is himself an alien, can flout the income tax laws for so many years and then get it "fixed up."

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, Frank Cammarata's criminal record.

There being no objection, the record was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIMINAL RECORD OF FRANK CAMMARATA (FBI, No. 9739) AS COMPILED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

February 13, 1921,[1] Detroit, Mich., disorderly person; discharged.

November 29, 1922, Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged .

September 23, 1923,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, not armed; discharged.

February 10, 1924,[1] Detroit, Mich., disorderly person; no disposition.

March 10, 1924,[1] Hamtramck, Mich., disorderly person; no disposition.

April 14, 1924,[1] Detroit, Mich., disorderly person; discharged.

May 6, 1924,[1] Detroit, Mich., investigation; discharged.

November 7, 1924, Rochester, N. Y., investigation; released.

November 7, 1924,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; forfeited bond.

March 22, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., violation Drug Act; turned over to Department of Justice.

March 30, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

April 26, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., violation Dyer Act; discharged.

June 15, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

June 15, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., violation of Dyer Act.

August 29, 1925, St. Louis, Mo., concealed weapon; discharged.

August 29, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

October 6, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., carrying offensive weapons; discharged.

May 24, 1926,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

March 31, 1927,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

May 15, 1927,[1] Detroit, Mich., disturbing the peace; $5 or 10 days.

August 8, 1927, Windsor, Ontario, possession of offensive weapons; 3 years; served 30 months.

May 19, 1930. Watertown, N. Y., violation National Motor Vehicle Act; turned over to Detroit court, Detroit, Mich.

February 26, 1931, Jackson, Mich., robbery, armed; 15 to 30 years.

December 15, 1950, Youngstown, Ohio, violation of parole.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask a question of the senior Senator from Delaware.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Delaware stated a few moments ago that he was unable to get a report on Frank Cammarata from the Treasury Department because the Senator is not a member of a committee. Frankly, I do not understand the situation. I always understood that any Member of the Senate could at any time write to any member of the Cabinet and get a reply.

I should like to inquire what the situation is in this case and why the Senator cannot get a reply with reference to this particular racketeer case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that I can get a reply from the Treasury Department, but as to getting certain information I had asked for I cannot get it. I should like to read to the Senator from North Dakota excerpts from a letter which I received from the Treasury Department with reference to the case. I had asked certain questions, such as who had settled the case, what the procedure was, the amount of tax delinquency, as well as terms of settlement. I quote from the reply which I received from the Treasury Department:

Specifically, we can tell you, in response to your first question, that Cammarata did fail to file income-tax returns for the period you mentioned.

The letter goes on to say:

An investigation covering most of the years you mentioned was made in 1948. We are securing additional details about the case from our field office. As soon as we receive this information, we will be in a position to reply more fully to some of your remaining questions. To what extent we can furnish you with information as to how the case was finally adjusted and settled, and the amounts involved, cannot be definitely stated at this time since section 55 will have some pertinence with respect to this type of data.

I may say further to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that it is the typical situation which a Senator encounters when he does not enjoy official committee status. That was the reason I had asked for a special subcommittee, so that I could follow through on these cases. The complete answer should be obtained and given to the American people.

However, it has been definitely established that Cammarata did not file tax returns, for the period indicated. He was not prosecuted.

[1] These arrests are unsupported by fingerprints in the Department of Justice files.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES TO COMMEMORATE THE TERCENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 719, S. 2474, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I hope the bill pending before the Senate will be passed. This year New York City will celebrate the 300th anniversary of its founding. A committee composed of distinguished citizens of New York has been appointed to conduct the anniversary celebration in a manner consistent with the dignity and stature of the great city. The event will serve to demonstrate to the people of our country and peoples abroad the tremendous importance of New York City both in domestic and foreign affairs.

I wish to point out that the passage of the bill will cause no substantial expense to the United States. The bill definitely provides that the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage shall not be borne by the United States, and that such coins shall be issued only upon payment of the face value of the coins by the committee which is in charge of the celebration.

New York City is not only the largest city in the State of the New York but is also the oldest. It is certainly the largest city in the United States, and, with the possible exception of London, the largest city in the world.

New York City has for three centuries played a very prominent part in the history of our country. It has been a Dutch city, a British city, and for the past 180 years an American city. It has been active in industry and commerce and in the cultural, educational, and spiritual life of the Nation. The issuance of the special coinage is a small but very appropriate recognition of the great part which New York City has played in the life of our Nation and of the free world.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is not on the floor. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the senior Senator from New York is a cosponsor of the bill, and that he filed the report of the subcommittee, of which I was the chairman, and he also filed the report of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 724) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill authorizes the Director of the Mint, in commemoration of the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York, to coin not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces. However, the initial number of such pieces to be coined would not be less than 200,000, which is slightly less than 1 week's production of coins on 1 press and is sufficiently large that it precludes the issue from acquiring an artificial-scarcity value.

Your committee wishes to emphasize that provision is made in the bill that the expense of making the models for master dies

or other preparation for their coinage shall not be borne by the United States.

The Treasury Department is authorized to issue to the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration the commemorative coins upon payment of the face value of such coins. The coins are to be issued in such numbers and at such times as shall be requested by the above-mentioned committee. The committee is, of course, a nonprofit organization, and any proceeds from the sale of the coin above par shall be used only for the purposes of participating in the tercentennial celebration of the foundation of the city of New York.

Your committee is fully aware that the Treasury Department for a number of years has consistently objected to the enactment of legislation authorizing the issuance of commemorative coins; and, while recognizing that there is much to be said for the objections which are raised to the policy of authorizing commemorative coins, it is your committee's considered judgment that exceptions should be made to the general policy when the event to be celebrated is, in the opinion of the Congress, of such magnitude and of such historical importance in the life of our country and its institutions that it deems the event should be commemorated.

The possible small additional cost to the United States in the issuance of the commemorative coin which this bill authorizes and which from time to time the Congress may authorize is, in your committee's opinion, far outweighed by the benefits that redound us as a people and a Nation. Our history, our traditions, our institutions are historic benchmarks in the development of the Nation, and their commemoration is symbolic of the spiritual and political development of the Nation, and they help as does our flag, to instill in the minds of our people that patriotic and spiritual fervor, without which we as a Nation cannot survive. We must be just as vigilant—in fact, more vigilant—about maintaining and encouraging the spiritual resources of the Nation as we are about the preservation and development of our physical and economic resources. The material resources of a nation can be dissipated or destroyed; the spirit, tradition, and sacred history of a nation, if reasonably protected and developed, will not only never die but will serve also to make it strong physically and economically.

With this in mind, your committee believes that the foundation of the city of New York is of such genuine national and historical interest that it is fitting and proper that a coin be issued in commemoration of the 300th anniversary.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

When Peter Stuyvesant and his council in 1653 proclaimed a grant of municipal government, placing city affairs in charge of 2 burgomasters (mayors), 5 schepens (councilmen), and a "shout" (prosecutor), western democracy was born in America. That municipal council was the first democratic institution on this continent. It, therefore, is your committee's belief that the celebration of the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York exceeds the boundaries of New York City.

In fact, the celebration of the foundation of the city of New York is of international importance. In 1783 negotiations started between the Dutch and the Continental Congress, which led to a loan of 5 million guilders for what is now the city of New York. It was in the city of New York that a farmer by the name of Klaes Martensen van Roosevelt arrived in the year 1650. He became the common ancestor of seven Presidents of the United States—James Madison, Martin Van Buren, Zachary Taylor, Ulysses S. Grant, William H. Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The city of New York, thus, historically and today is truly one of the first cities, not only of the State of New York but of the United States. It is our largest city, and its size, its importance, its tremendous development, and, to a very large extent, its history is dependent and inextricably tied to the history and development of our Nation.

It is therefore fitting that the 300th anniversary of the foundation of this great city be commemorated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the foundation of the city of New York, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces shall not be less than 200,000: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the purposes of such committee in connection with the observance of said tercentennial.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers, and at such times as shall be requested by the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 2-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DR. JOHN ZIGBDIS, MEMBER OF THE GREEK PARLIAMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself, I am happy to announce to the Senate that we have as a guest in the Senate Chamber, Dr. John Zigbdis, a member of the Greek Parliament for 4 years, and formerly Minister of Industry in the Greek Cabinet.

I am sure that our colleagues are happy to welcome Dr. Zigbdis as a representative of a courageous and friendly nation, and I hope as many Members as can do so will come and greet him. [Applause.]

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it had been my intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, H. R. 1917, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; but, at the request of the minority, because both Senators from Louisiana are at present absent from the floor, I shall not move the consideration of the bill at this time. Instead, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 831, S. 2643, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. However, as soon as the Senators from Louisiana enter the Chamber, I shall ask that the agricultural bill be temporarily laid aside so that the Senate may extend the same courtesy to the Senators from Louisiana with respect to the coinage bill which was extended to the other Senators with reference to the other coinage bills.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 831, Senate bill 2643, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the cotton-acreage proposal contained in the bill does not alter the permanent legislation which is now on the statute books. All through the bill, as it comes before the Senate, an effort is made to provide temporary legislation for the 1954 growing season. If, subsequently, it is desired to make changes, that can be done after hearings have been held and an opportunity given to all persons to be heard upon it. That is why a great many things which might have been considered in the bill have been postponed for subsequent action.

It is extremely important that the cotton farmers know what their allocations for 1954 are going to be sufficiently early

so that they may make their plans for their planting.

The planting season for cotton varies greatly among the States now receiving quotas under the law. There are States where the planting will start early in February or probably late in January. There are other States which do not need to know their quotas until perhaps March or April, but, nonetheless, if the bill is to pass, it should be passed immediately and the Secretary of Agriculture, at the earliest possible moment, should give to the States an opportunity to know what their quotas are going to be.

The bill does 3 or 4 things. It starts by providing that the acreage allotment, which is at present restricted to a sufficient number of acres to produce 10 million bales of cotton, which the Secretary of Agriculture has determined to be 17,910,000 acres, may be increased to a minimum of 21 million acres. That is the first temporary relief which the bill provides.

I may say that that temporary relief is based upon the fact that the present acreage is somewhere in the neighborhood of 26 million. It might normally come down to 18 million acres if the 10-million-bale limitation should be enforced, and this bill is a halfway step toward what the final limitation would be. It gives the farmer 2 years in which to adjust, rather than a single year, and for that reason seems to be desirable.

While the bill does not exactly follow the recommendations the Secretary of Agriculture announced some time ago, it does come to about the same figure, because he said he would make a recommendation that acreage be increased to 21 million acres, once the first step had been taken.

Then the bill contains a provision for some hardship acreage, which runs to a total of 315,000 acres. One-half of that has been allotted to the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other States, excluding those which receive minimum allotments under the so-called minimum production plan. For example, the State of Nevada gets a minimum allotment, which is not necessarily taken care of by this special arrangement.

There is an additional provision that the acreage of no State shall be cut more than 34 percent. That applies specifically and only to the State of Arizona and California. Since those States have an irrigated cotton situation, it is extremely difficult to cut back the acreage very rapidly. Farmers, perhaps realizing that there were no quotas last year, went ahead and planted to cotton a rather large number of acres during 1953. Some of that acreage is within old, well-established areas that would get quotas, but when farmers have gone to the expense of installing pumps and various other appliances required for cotton farming on irrigated land, it is extremely difficult to cut back quotas suddenly, though it was felt that it may be possible gradually to take care of this situation. So there is special consideration given to those two States for the year 1954 only.

I say special consideration is accorded to those two States for the year 1954 only, because by 1955, the quota which may be established for 1955 will take into consideration the very high plantings in the States of Arizona and California. It is my belief, and I am certain it is the belief of others, that after 1954 the California and Arizona situations will be taken care of by the history which those States have.

The allotments are made to the other States on the basis of their history for the last 5 years. Taking into consideration 1951, 1952, and 1953, those States would be given this year a great deal more acreage for cotton than they would otherwise be entitled to receive. This temporary adjustment is to be for the sake of those States for this 1 year.

Those are the three main provisions as they relate to cotton. Undoubtedly there will be questions raised with respect to those provisions.

Two subsequent items are covered in the bill, which I desire to mention briefly before returning to the main items of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I desire to report a committee amendment to the bill. The amendment is offered by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, section 2 also contains a provision which relates to cotton. It is in rather general terms, but is confined to a given area and to cotton only. It relates to a situation where a major flood control reservoir has been constructed. Obviously, it would not be fair to cover by reservoir such a cotton-producing area which had brought a cotton-producing history to the State, and which could be used subsequently for that purpose, and not allow land somewhere else to be utilized for the production of cotton. So section 2 is simply an amendment to the law so as to permit that to be done.

In section 3 there is a complete change in what is covered by section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Whenever, after investigation, it is determined that a substantial difference exists between the usage and the marketing outlets of certain kinds of wheat, the Secretary may authorize expansion of the acreage devoted to such wheat. That is illustrated by the situation with relation to durum wheat.

Durum wheat is produced in three States only, namely, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. But actually the growing of durum wheat is almost entirely confined to the State of North Dakota. The acreage in both Minnesota and South Dakota is small. At present, there is not sufficient durum wheat produced in the United States to take care of the market needs. Manufacturers of macaroni and products of that nature need and require the production of durum wheat. Present limitations are such that not enough durum wheat is being produced, and the price of such wheat is considerably above support limits and the market price of other types of wheat.

We would be placing ourselves in a ridiculous position if, when there is already a scarcity of durum wheat, we should continue to clamp down on durum-wheat acreage and impose restrictions that would make it impossible to grow even the small quantity now produced.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New Mexico yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from New Mexico has made a very fine statement for the wheat amendment. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to insert in the RECORD several telegrams and communications I have received from the Farm Bureau, the Farmers' Union, and other organizations and individuals on behalf of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I should be very happy to have them placed in the RECORD; and the Senator from North Dakota may make any further statement he wishes to make on the subject. However, I am trying to assure the Senator that the provision I am now discussing relates to a local situation only, where, without the provision in the bill, we would be restricting the production of a commodity already in short supply. It would not help farm production generally to be doing that sort of thing. By the proposed amendment, we would be making it possible to increase the supply.

Mr. YOUNG. There is presently only a 40-percent supply of durum on hand to meet the requirements of macaroni makers.

At present, durum wheat is selling for about $4 a bushel, or double the amount good spring wheat is bringing. That is due almost entirely to a bad rust situation. Our present varieties of durum wheat are no longer resistant to a new type of rust known as 15B, and until we can find a new variety of rust-resistant durum, we shall have a hard time producing enough durum wheat to meet our domestic requirements. I think it would be most unfortunate to reduce the acreage of durum wheat now, when we ought to be increasing it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the material submitted by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

The material is as follows:

AMBER MILLING DIVISION,
FARMERS UNION GRAIN
TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., December 24, 1953.

To: M. W. Thatcher.
Re 1954 durum acreage.

The present durum supply is so inadequate it is necessary for the durum mills to grind a mixture of 50-percent durum and 50-percent hard wheats.

In spite of the short durum supply in the United States and in other countries, under

present law a further reduction in acreage will be forced in our North Dakota durum territory. We believe such a decrease in acreage is against the public interest, as well as against the interest of the durum producer. It is desirable to have a 1954 durum acreage of at least 3 million to 3,500,000 acres. To get this acreage, the present law must be amended. We believe this objective can be best reached by removing entirely restrictions on the acreage of durum in the main producing counties of Pembina, Cavalier, Towner, Rolette, Bottineau, Walsh, Ramsey, Benson, Pierce, Wells, Eddy, Foster, Nelson, Ransom, and Sargent, all in the State of North Dakota.

If this cannot be done, then each durum grower's allotment should be set at the highest acreage of durum wheat he planted in any one of the last 5 years, with the allotment in no case to be less than his 1953 durum acreage.

If neither of the above methods of relief can be put into effect, then each durum grower should have as his allotment his full average durum wheat acreage, but in no case should his allotment be less than his 1953 acreage.

If restrictions are not removed on durum acreage in the above mentioned counties, the durum acreage will probably be greatly reduced and that of hard wheat increased, because hard wheat is regarded as a surer crop. Hard wheat is in plentiful supply.

Any increase in durum acreage will result in a corresponding reduction in the acreage of hard wheat, barley and flax, all of which are in plentiful supply.

We believe that the removal of restrictions on durum will not result in a burdensome supply of durum, for the following reasons:

1. Without restrictions, the acreage of durum wheat has exceeded 3,500,000 acres only once in the last 15 years and then only slightly.

2. Durum is particularly susceptible to 15–B stem rust because of its longer growing season; therefore, many growers will not plant durum.

3. Durum wheat planted on summer fallow, especially fertilized summer fallow, has been hardest hit by rust. In 1954 more durum will be seeded on second year and unfertilized land, which will result in low yields unless the season is exceptionally favorable.

4. By the time another durum crop is harvested, the pipelines will be empty both as to durum and durum products.

5. There has been a steady increase in consumption of macaroni products made from durum wheat, both per capita, and in total tonnage.

6. There should be an export demand for at least 5 to 10 million bushels. Canada, in the past, has been the major supplier to the export market. The Canadian acreage has declined year after year, mainly because durum does not command a premium there.

7. There is a short world supply of durum. The Swiss Government recently issued regulations requiring the mixing of hard wheat with durum ground, to conserve their durum supplies.

Other wheats do not produce macaroni with quality equal to that made from durum. Even macaroni made from the 50–50 blend, while the best available, is of unsatisfactory quality. The short supply of durum has resulted in very high prices, and the cost of macaroni to the consumer is the highest in history. The public, therefore, is forced to pay high prices for food of unsatisfactory quality. This condition can be corrected only by an adequate supply of durum wheat.

Attached hereto are durum acreage and production statistics since 1940.

Yours very truly,

D. J. COOK.
JULE WAFER.

	Production	Harvested acres
	Millions of bushels	*Thousands*
1935-39 average	26.3	2,601
1940	32.3	3,029
1941	40.7	2,524
1942	41.3	2,109
1943	33.5	2,078
1944	29.7	2,057
1945	32.8	2,004
1946	35.8	2,453
1947	44.3	2,948
1948	44.7	3,187
1949	38.8	3,525
1950	37.2	2,829
1951	34.8	2,518
1952	21.4	2,153
1953	13.4	1,865

DURUM USE

Mill grind, 24 to 26 million bushels; cereal and other uses, 1 to 2 million bushels; seed, 3½ to 4 million bushels; export, 5 to 10 million bushels; total, 33½ to 42 million bushels.

PRICE SUPPORTS—EXCERPT FROM 1954 RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Since our 1953 platform was approved in November 1952, there have been no efforts made to introduce the factor of quality into the support program, to make realistic reductions in production of basics or to take any other realistic steps to put the support program in a sounder postion.

Therefore we urge Congress to enact extension of the amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949, providing for a minimum support of 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities.

We ask that this extension be for a period suitable in length to enable proper reduction of national wheat acreages and of other basic acreages where surpluses exist.

We will accept marketing quotas and acreage restrictions to accomplish this goal of matching production with demand.

With shrinkage of the present wheat surplus we ask Congress and the industry to work toward our common goal of full 100 percent of parity income in the marketplace.

In view of the present short supply of good amber durum for milling purposes, and the necessity of increasing that supply in order that the industry may continue to manufacture high quality durum wheat products such as the American consuming public demands, we, the members of the Towner County Crop Improvement Association, do propose that wheat acreage allotments for 1954 be increased by 30 percent for any durum grower who can produce evidence of having marketed amber durum during each of the past 3 years and will seed at least 70 percent of his wheat acres to amber durum in 1954.

TOWNER COUNTY CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
R. E. PILE, *President.*

DURUM WHEAT—EXCERPT FROM 1954 RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Our own industry, particular to North Dakota, in which we supply the macaroni industry with durum wheat, is in serious trouble due to a combination of rust and drouth.

The trouble arises from an inability to supply the demand and this can result in a halt in the growth of macaroni consumption by the United States public. Efforts by the industry to use substitutes have failed.

Therefore we ask for prompt legislation by Congress to permit any farmer (with a previous durum history in 1951, 1952, or 1953) who plants 40 percent of his 1954 allotted wheat acres to durum, to be permitted to seed to durum additional acres to bring his total wheat and durum acres up to his total farm wheat base acreage.

This formula will apply to the 1954 crop year only and does not apply to red durum.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 8, 1954.*

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly request your support amendment to cotton quota bill to include durum wheat which will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to exclude durum from acreage allotment. Present extreme shortage durum wheat harms consumers, processors, and producers. Acute durum wheat shortage certain to prevail for many years even without acreage restrictions.

F. PEAVEY HEFFELFINGER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 6, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The durum wheat industry is in a critical condition because of destructive stem rust epidemics during 3 of the last 4 crop seasons. Normal annual durum grind for domestic consumption in the United States requires 25 million bushels. My recent survey indicates less than 10 million bushels millable durum available after deducting 1954 seed requirements, purchases by puffers and other users. Macaroni products now made from durum wheat are an economical and important part of our national diet. Durum wheat is a specialized crop grown to produce a high quality specific product. Durum never should have been included with other wheats under the acreage allotment program for it is used for another purpose and does not compete with them on the market. In addition it is in short supply and apt to remain in that condition for some time, even if acreages of former growers were unrestricted. The reason is the lack of resistant varieties of durum to race 15B of stem rust. Consumers, processors, and producers are seriously affected by the present situation. We urge that you speed action to correct acreage allotment restriction on durum production in present durum area.

DONALD FLETCHER,
Secretary, Rust Prevention Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 6, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Durum is a specialty crop. The 1953 crop of 13 million bushels is not half enough to provide the consumers demand for macaroni products. There will be no carryover in 1954. The removal of durum acreage restriction for durum growers should help to increase the 1954 durum supplies.

HENRY O. PUTNAM,
Executive Secretary, Northwest Crop Improvement Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 6, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently need larger amounts durum wheat for milling for macaroni trade. Prior advent durum wheat into U. S. A. nearly all macaroni products were imported. Now domestic macaroni sales exceed $197 million annually. Must have durum wheat to protect this business. Urge no restrictions planting durum wheat by farmers with historical record of durum growing in prior years.

H. H. KING FLOUR MILLS, INC.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 5, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Endorse your effort secure durum exemption from acreage allotments provided confined to farms having recent durum acreage history and limited to average acreage on those farms seeded to durum since 1950. Closing market today No. 2 durum 58 to 59 pounds, 11 percent protein, $3.74. If heavy No. 1 amber durum available it would bring $4, and several cars 1952 durum have sold for over $4 during December. Production of 14 million bushels this year satisfies only 40 percent of present domestic demand. Durum acreage has receded for several years with result that 1953 seeded acreage at average yield 15 bushels would not have met demand. Adulteration of semolina flour with Farina has resulted distinctly inferior product. Strongly urge regulations be tailored permit North Dakota to produce requirements for this unique and easily identifiable wheat.

J. W. HAW.

PALATINE, ILL., *January 6, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Macaroni manufacturers and durum millers urge every consideration be given relaxation of wheat quotas on durum which is in very short supply. Your cooperation with Agriculture Committee will be most appreciated.

ROBERT M. GREEN,
Secretary, National Macaroni Manufacturers Association.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 7, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:

The durum milling industry is faced with a critical shortage of durum wheat. Our normal durum grind is 24 to 26 million bushels annually. Production of millable durum this year was less than half that amount. Carryover from previous crops was very small. There will be no carryover to next crop.

The semolina and durum flours ground from durum wheat are required by the manufacturers of macaroni and noodles for the manufacture of high-quality products. An adequate supply of durum wheat is necessary to maintain the quality of these important foods and to permit consumers to purchase them at reasonable prices.

Because 90 percent of all milling durum production is in the "durum triangle" of North Dakota, our industry and the macaroni industry and the American consumer are entirely dependent upon the farmers of that territory for durum supplies. Since durum wheat is in critically short supply rather than in a surplus position, durum wheat acreage in the durum triangle of North Dakota should be excluded from the acreage allotment program. We urge, in the interest of consumers, producers, and processors, that you seek exclusion of durum wheat from acreage allotment restrictions in the durum territory.

JULE M. WABER,
Chairman, Durum Committee, Millers' National Federation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree completely with the Senator from North Dakota. For that reason, although the committee tried to restrict the bill and to make it an emergency measure affecting cotton, we felt this matter ought to be dealt with now, so that the farmers, in planning their spring plantings, could make sure of large plantings of durum wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is true, even with the acreage of 21,315,000 acres which will be allowed under the bill, that it will result in the withdrawal from cultivation of about 4 million acres presently devoted to the production of cotton?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it will result in a reduction of about four or five million acres now planted in cotton. If the experience of the 1949 law can be used as a guide, it might result in a still further reduction in acreage. That is impossible to predict. However, Congress passed a law in 1949, and then subsequently amended it in 1950 to cover hardship cases. The hardship amendment would have permitted about 21,708,000 acres of cotton. I do not exactly guarantee that figure, but it is close. There was a planting of 21,600,000 acres of cotton. Actually, the farmers harvested only about 18 million acres of cotton, because of a great deal of so-called cutting back of cotton quotas, after several years when cotton had not been under quotas.

We do not have exactly the same situation at present, but we have very much the same situation. This allotment of 21,370,000 acres could result in the planting of perhaps only nineteen or twenty million acres of cotton.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may ask a further question of the Senator, are any restrictions placed in the bill on the uses to which the land thus withdrawn from the production of cotton will be devoted?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. There has been a great deal of discussion on that point, and suggestions have been made that a law should be passed strictly providing for the disposition of this acreage. That comes under the head of permanent legislation, and we would have been here a very long time if we had tried to enact such legislation.

A very fine farm organization, with which the Senator is familiar, has recommended that all acres diverted from the production of crops, such as wheat, corn, and cotton, that may be taken out of production because of acreage limitations, should not be allowed to be put into certain other types of crops, such as soybeans, in which the Senator's State is very much intersted. That farm organization has recommended that those acres be used to restore fertility to the soil; that the farmer be required to plant crops which will increase the fertility of the land and then plow those crops under. However, it would be a very drastic remedy to be prescribed until we can ascertain what it will mean State by State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not possible that in improving the condition of the cotton farmers by restriction of the acreage, with a consequent higher unit price than would otherwise be obtained, and a total higher gross income, nevertheless, by diverting acreage to other crops we would worsen conditions in other sections of the country?

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the able Senator from Illinois that that always is a consideration which is present in these limitation-of-acreage bills. I will say, however, that when acreage limitations were put into effect in 1950 they did not result in the dislocation of all or any large segments of American agriculture.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The same reasoning would apply to wheat or corn, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The same question was not raised when the wheat bills were under discussion. The Senator did not raise the question then.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say that in the case of wheat and corn we had in mind the fact that a great deal of pasture land in States such as Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa had been ripped up during the war. The wheat and corn bills gave the farmers opportunity to put that land back into pasture. It is a fine soil conservation practice, but to encourage it is one thing and to require it is quite something else. Many times, while it is encouraged, there is no requirement to do it by proper legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I was not proposing any provision as to cotton which should not apply to other crops, but this is the first of the farm bills we are to consider, and we are going to have the same problem in connection with future farm bills, namely, what is to be done with the acreage which will be withdrawn from cultivation in supporting crops on which marketing quotas and acreage restrictions have been imposed? It seems to me it is important to settle this question from the beginning, rather than to make no limitations on certain crops, or to introduce a system for corn and wheat which is different from the system in the bills which provide for cotton.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say, in reply, that we are all desirous of enacting appropriate temporary legislation which deals with the farm problem, but I do not think it is possible to answer, and I think we will get into serious trouble if we try to answer every one of these questions immediately and try to handle the complete farm program as a whole.

When the wheat acreage bill comes up, I shall be in favor of giving some temporary relief. I introduced some bills on the subject, and pointed out that it was not necessary to plant or harvest a single kernel of wheat in 1954 to take care of our domestic needs. The same thought applies to cotton and other crops. I am very much in favor of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry trying to work out a permanent program for handling acres diverted from excess crops, but I do not think the enactment of temporary legislation is the way to handle it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If I may reply to the Senator from Illinois, he said we should adopt the proposed program as a beginning. This is not the beginning. We have passed a wheat bill which provided for acreage reduction, and under which acres diverted from wheat are already planted to oats, rye, barley, and other grain crops.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that in my opinion the question of dealing with diverted acreages is one of the most serious problems of the entire farm program, so serious that in the President's message on agriculture yesterday he called special attention to it, and indicated what the 25 million acres diverted this year from cotton and wheat should be planted to. I noticed that the President estimated that 3 million acres could be planted to soy beans, which would have a very definite effect on the State of Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very much so. Soy beans are an important crop in Illinois and we will be injured if erstwhile cotton acreage is turned to soy beans.

Mr. AIKEN. The acreage diverted from wheat undoubtedly will be planted to oats, barley, and a good many other similar crops, which will nullify the effect of acreage allotments on corn.

The situation is such that if we are to continue the practice of controlling acreage which can be planted to certain crops, we most certainly will have to find some means of controlling the acreage taken out of such crop production.

As the Senator from New Mexico has said, we would be engaged in discussion for a long time if we undertook to do that through a temporary relief measure; and the pending bill is a relief measure. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], as many of our colleagues know, comprise the subcommittee which has been working on the cotton-acreage problem for the last 8 or 9 months. They did not get anywhere with its last summer, and, as Senators recall, after Congress adjourned the rains came and several million more bales of cotton were produced than we expected there would be when Congress adjourned in August. The Senators from the other cotton-growing States, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], although he was not a member of the committee, have all worked diligently in an attempt to agree on as fair a bill as possible. No one claims the pending bill is a perfect measure. Any Senator from a cotton-growing State can find something to object to in it. He can probably point out something in the bill that is unfair to his State. But time is of the essence. What would result under the bill as a whole would be much better for the cotton growers than the situation was before the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and others undertook to do something about it.

In the main, the pending measure is a 1-year bill, and I hope it may be passed in such shape that it can become law and afford genuine relief to the hundreds of thousands of small cotton farmers in all the States where cotton is produced.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am happy he mentioned the very hard work done by both the senior and junior Senators from Mississippi, the Senator from Florida, the Senator from California, and the Senators from Texas. All these Senators have been trying hard to prepare a measure which can be passed and which will afford a degree of assistance at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the difficulties under which the committee has been working, and I, too, am grateful for their energy and devotion in seeking to meet the situation. But the question as to what should be done with the acreage taken out of cultivation is an extremely important one.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, if the Senator will wait a moment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I merely desire to answer the question of the Senator from Illinois, and to explain something along the line of his question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that if legislation such as that now proposed is not enacted, there will not only be a reduction to 21,600,000 or 21,700,000 bales, but there will be a reduction to 17,900,000 bales. In that event the Senator from Illinois would be complaining a great deal, I believe, about the diversion of so many acres—many more, I believe, than would be diverted under this particular amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, Mr. President; I wanted to say the same thing a moment ago to the Senator from Illinois. I was looking to the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from California; and I was realizing that if the original allocation made by the Secretary of Agriculture had gone into effect, the acreage in California would have dropped from approximately 1,406,000 acres to approximately 700,000; and the acreage in Arizona would have dropped from approximately 660,000 or 630,000 acres to approximately 300,000. Those 700,000 eliminated acres in California and 300,000 eliminated acres in Arizona consist of irrigated land that is extremely productive, could go into the production of other crops; and if that much of a change were made quickly, it would tend to destroy certain other segments of our agricultural economy.

For example, at one time the State of California had to reduce sharply its cotton acreage and go into the production of tomatoes; and as a result, for a long time the Department of Agriculture was purchasing great quantities of tomatoes.

Similarly, there could be an enormous increase in the production of potatoes, as occurred some time ago, and thus cause great difficulty to the potato producers of Maine, Idaho, and many other States.

So the problem is a very large one. We are trying to reduce it a little. However, it would be much worse to proceed in the way the Senator from Illinois suggested as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Mexico is still proceeding?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If he will yield to me, let me say that what he and the Senator from South Carolina are saying is, "If we do not pass this bill, conditions will be worse."

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the real question, however, is whether we cannot make this bill better by providing for a better use of the acreage which is taken out from the production of cotton.

I should like to suggest, for consideration at least, that there be included in the bill an amendment to provide that the acreage withdrawn from cultivation shall be devoted to soil-building purposes, whether by the planting of legumes which are nitrogen fixing or by devoting the acreage to pasturage, or by other methods.

I say very frankly that by means of this present measure we shall be establishing a precedent which may very well continue in other agricultural bills. If we withdraw 4 million acres from the production of cotton, and if later other acreages are withdrawn from the production of other crops, and if such withdrawn acreage is devoted to the growing of vegetables, or soybeans, or other crops, we shall merely be transferring the problem from one group of farmers to another group of farmers.

In view of the fact that the soil of the Nation needs to be built up, what objection is there to providing that the acreage thus withdrawn shall be devoted to soil-building purposes?

That is the proposal of the President in his farm message of yesterday. I think this would be an excellent time for us to evidence a little cooperation with the administration.

So I offer this amendment as one which is submitted in the hope, at least, that our friends across the aisle will rise to its support.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield further to me——

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois by saying that we had to take into consideration a

great many of the small farmers. When we consider the fact that 39,145 farms in South Carolina plant less than 5 acres to cotton, and that in my State only 845 farms plant more than 99 acres to cotton, we realize that if all those farmers are forced to engage in soil-building practices and soil conservation or soil preservation instead of the growing of cotton, we would penalize and hurt very badly a great many of the small farmers.

Mr. DOUGLAS and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield briefly, first, to the Senator from Illinois; and then I shall yield to others of my colleagues.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would not object to a classification system which would provide that farms of less than a given number of acres should not be made subject to the amendment I suggest, but that in the case of farms of more than the given acreage the amendment would apply. It seems to me that the proposed amendment embodies a proposal which might well be considered.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield now to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to do so, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for preserving and protecting the cotton acreage in Kansas. I notice that previously 88 acres in Kansas were planted to cotton, and that now we are to be allowed to have 80 acres planted to cotton. I thank the Senator very much. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, Mr. President, the time may come when cotton will become an important crop in Kansas.

I yield now to the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement.

As a result of the allocations which were prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the present law, I believe it is the unanimous opinion of all individuals familiar with conditions in the States in the Cotton Belt and the Southwest that an emergency situation has been created, and that if the cotton production of those States is to receive any assistance whatsoever from this Congress, it is necessary that Congress pass a law in the nature of an emergency measure, and do so now. I believe it is agreed that we need to pass such a law now.

I do not think any comment need be made regarding the merits or demerits of the suggestion made by the able Senator from Illinois; but if it is true that there is an emergency—and I believe people generally concede that there is one—then we are faced with an emergency piece of proposed legislation which is in the nature of a compromise, and which should not be the vehicle for any such recommendations as those just made by the Senator from Illinois, no matter how potentially meritorious those recommendations may be.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to commend very strongly the subcommittee which has worked out this measure in the main, and which is entitled, I believe, to great credit. I should also like to invite the attention of all Senators present, including the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to the table on page 3 of the committee report, which shows, with reference to my own State, the highly critical condition now existing, and which must be corrected by early action or else not be corrected at all, because the planting in my State will have to take place within the next 3 or 4 weeks, at the latest.

My colleagues will note that the planting in the State of Florida—and while Florida is not a large factor in the cotton industry, yet, to each individual there who is engaged in producing cotton, it is a very important matter—last year was 71,000 acres, whereas the recent allocation or allotment made by the Secretary of Agriculture under existing law allows our State only 33,122 acres, or less than half the acreage planted last year.

If the remedial action proposed to be taken by means of this bill is not taken speedily, so far as we in Florida are concerned, there will be no purpose in taking it at all, because our cotton has to be planted within the next few weeks.

The second point I should like to make—and again, I hope the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is following this discussion—is that in the State of Florida, at least, most of the acreage of cotton is produced by tenant farmers, and it is generally produced on small acreage; frequently 3 or 4 or 5 acres will be the average planting. Both because it is a tenant-farmer operation and because it is such a small operation, it is obvious that any attempt to write on the floor legislation which would force conservation practices in that kind of situation would be bound to be hurtful, rather than helpful.

I desire to assure the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I join him in the feeling that the permanent legislation which should be enacted must deal with the important question he has mentioned. I felt so last year when we handled the emergency wheat problem, which, by the way, reduced the wheat acreage from 78,500,000 to 62,000,000; and that reduction was so great as to make it of vastly greater consequence than anything that is provided for in the measure now before the Senate.

But it would still seem obvious that without extensive hearings which would take into consideration the differences in soil and in conservation practices and the differences in landowner operations, tenant operations, and the like, it would be impossible to bring forth any sound legislative proposal in these fields.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois has made a very fine suggestion, in which I join him, with respect to a permanent program. I shall insist, with him, that something be done to make sure that when, under permanent legislation, we reduce an important acreage we shall not aggravate the problems of producers of other products.

Nevertheless, I hope that he will not insist upon any amendment to this bill, because, in the very nature of things, it is an emergency measure which must be passed at once. It could not be passed if it were to have added to it on the floor a poorly considered conservation-practice amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is much needed emergency legislation. In considering this question the committee tried to iron out the features which might stir up too much controversy, in order that, when the measure reached the floor of the Senate, it could be passed. We all realize that it is not perfect by any means.

It will be recalled that on December 15, 1953, the Secretary of Agriculture called for a vote upon acreage control. At that time in South Carolina 98 percent of the cotton farmers voted for it. They did so in the expectation that the Congress would make some adjustments in the legislation which are badly needed by the cotton farmers of my State. The same is true of the cotton farmers of other States.

Senate bill 2643 makes some adjustments, but they fit mainly the irrigation sections of the Western States. Furthermore, they take away a share of the cotton market from the farmers of my State and place it in the hands of giant cotton factories in States where per capita farm income is already among the highest in the Nation.

I went along with this bill in committee in the interest of harmony. However, it must not be considered as a precedent for legislating economic advantage from one area to another.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that of 90,811 farms with cotton allotments in 1950, 39,145 had 5 acres or less. Of 51,666 remaining, only 845 had allotments of 99 acres or more.

Mr. President, I believe it must be agreed that the 13,470 farms on which cotton was grown in California, New Mexico, and Arizona are faced with less drastic hardship from necessary cotton reduction than are the farmers of South Carolina, many of whom are finding it most difficult to keep going financially in the face of the increased prices which farmers must pay for the things they must buy.

There are several changes in the law which are not embodied in Senate bill 2643, but which are badly needed as the law affects the southeastern cotton growers. I shall not offer any amendments at this particular time, but I ask that they be printed in the RECORD. It is my understanding that they are embodied in House bill 6665, which passed the House of Representatives. They should be included before the pending legislation becomes law.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the various amendments to which I have referred. I do not ask that they be considered at this time, but I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERMANENT-TYPE AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 344, AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, WHICH SHOULD BE ADDED TO SENATE BILL 2643

SEC. 5. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) The proviso in section 344 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1938 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and following: "or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship."

(Explanation: Sec. 344 (e) provides that not to exceed 10 percent of the State acreage allotment (15 percent in Oklahoma) may be set up in a State reserve. The use of this acreage is now limited to making adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, abnormal conditions affecting plantings, or for small or new farms. By adding the words "to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardships," to this section, the State committee will then have the additional latitude needed to place acres where they can do the most good. As the law is now written, unless a farm falls in one of the specified categories, it is ineligible to receive help from the State reserve.)

(b) Section 344 (f) (3) is amended by striking out the colon before the word "provided" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding "or in making adjustments in farm acreage allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardships."

(Explanation: Sec. 344 (f) (3) deals with use of the county reserve acreage. The proposed amendment would liberalize the use of such reserves, thereby helping to prevent hardships at the farm level.)

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, and beginning in 1955 and continuing therefrom, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, or among farms in administrative areas, the county acreage allotment, or that of administrative areas, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted in any 1 of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm during such 3-year period. If the acreage allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county or administrative area, in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3).

(Explanation: This provision would give county committees the authority to select the method that will more nearly fit local conditions in distributing acreage from the county level to the farm. The law as now written provides that acreage will be distributed to farms on a percentage of cropland factor basis. This provision will allow the county committees, in 1955 and thereafter, to either distribute acreage allotments on either a percentage of cropland factor basis or an individual farm history basis. Senate bill 2643 makes this provision for 1954 only, however, so it is important that provision should be made for such an optional feature on a long-term basis. The individual farm history method of distributing acreage to the farm level will, in most instances, more nearly fit the needs of the Southeastern States. However, the percentage of cropland factor method more nearly fits the farm pattern in other areas. By giving county committeemen the authority to select the method of distribution, local requirements will more nearly be met.)

(d) In determining the national acreage allotment for cotton for 1955 and thereafter, the Secretary shall give due consideration to acreage normally underplanted and abandoned.

(Explanation: This provision will allow the Secretary of Agriculture to take into consideration normal rates of abandonment and underplantings in setting the level of allotment for any particular year. The present law, section 344 (a), states: "The national acreage allotment for cotton shall be that acreage, based upon the national average yield per acre of cotton for the 5 years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, required to make available from such crop an amount of cotton equal to the national marketing quota." Section 342 states that the national marketing quota shall not be less than 10 million bales or 1 million bales less than the estimated domestic consumption plus exports, whichever is smaller. For 1954, the marketing quota would therefore be 10 million bales. The 5-year rate of abandonment is 2½ percent. In 1953, the rate of abandonment was 3.7 percent. In 1950, the last year of allotments, underplantings amounted to nearly 15 percent. Had the Secretary been able to take these facts into consideration, he could have set a national allotment in the neighborhood of 19½ or 20 million acres. The Solicitor ruled, however, that the Secretary did not have the authority to take these facts into consideration.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing allocation of State acreage allotments for cotton under the provisions of Senate bill 2643. This table is a corrected copy of the table contained in the committee report, which failed to show Nevada's full allotment of 2,289 acres with the error of 289 acres being distributed to other States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed State allotments for 1954 upland cotton and related data

State	1952 planted acreage [1]	1953 acreage in cultivation July 1	1954 State acreage allotments 17,910,448	State shares of national allotment of 21,000,000 acres [2]	State adjustments on basis of 5-year average [3]		State acreage added by reason of 66 percent provision [4]	State acreage added by reason of 15 percent provision	Proposed State acreage allotments
					157,500	157,500			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*
Alabama	1,605,000	1,630,000	1,139,121	1,335,690	10,711				1,346,401
Arizona	627,000	643,500	288,223	337,958		39,362	36,495		413,815
Arkansas	2,040,000	2,112,000	1,562,684	1,832,343	14,693				1,847,036
California	1,418,800	1,381,600	697,806	818,220		95,298	22,879		936,397
Florida	56,800	71,000	33,122	38,837	311			4,968	44,116
Georgia	1,479,930	1,387,000	1,005,862	1,179,436	9,458				1,188,894
Illinois	2,750	2,400	[5] 4,000	[5] 4,000					[5] 4,000
Kansas	35		[5] 80	[5] 80					[5] 80
Kentucky	10,500	10,500	9,136	10,713	86				10,799
Louisiana	900,000	954,000	634,906	744,466	5,970				750,436
Mississippi	2,435,000	2,554,000	1,759,641	2,063,288	16,545				2,079,833
Missouri	525,000	570,000	391,396	458,936	3,681				462,617
Nevada	1,950	2,000	[5] 2,289	[5] 2,289					2,289
New Mexico	288,000	301,200	167,243	196,102		22,840			218,942
North Carolina	765,000	781,000	528,638	619,860	4,971				624,831
Oklahoma	1,310,000	1,058,000	929,202	1,089,547	8,736				1,098,283
South Carolina	1,160,000	1,181,000	786,006	921,640	7,390				929,030
Tennessee	865,000	959,000	575,891	675,268	5,415				680,683
Texas	12,287,965	9,656,400	7,376,858	8,649,817	69,361				8,719,178
Virginia	27,000	30,000	18,344	21,510	172				21,682
United States	27,805,730	25,284,600	17,910,448	21,000,000	157,500	157,500	59,374	4,968	21,379,342

[1] Acreage in cultivation July 1, plus abandonment prior to July as estimated by the Crop Reporting Board, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[2] Apportioned to States on basis of acreages used in establishing allotments shown in col. (3).

[3] 157,500 acres apportioned to California, Arizona, and New Mexico on basis of their 5-year base one to the other. 157,500 acres apportioned to remaining States (except Nevada, Kansas, and Illinois) on basis of their 5-year base one to the other.

[4] Minimum State allotments, Public Law 272, 81st Cong.

[5] Acreage required to increase State acreage allotment to not less than 66 percent of the 1952 planted acreage.

Prepared by: Cotton Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, USDA.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I join in what the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has just said. This is an emergency bill. It should not and will not establish a precedent for the legislation of economic advantage from one section of the country to the other. I believe that the South—and I am frank to say that that is where my main interest lies—would receive a considerable advantage from this bill.

In the State of Mississippi there are 18 counties which did not have a sufficient cotton allotment to give the little 5-acre farmer the minimum allotment to which he was entitled. In 50 counties in the State of Mississippi there were a great many farmers whose cotton acreage was reduced 50, 60, 70, 80, or 90 percent. I know of one man, at one time editor of a farm publication, who in 1953 had 300 measured acres in cotton. His acreage allotment for 1954 was 40 acres. There are thousands of instances in the State similar to the case of a man at Utica, Miss., who had 280 acres in cotton last year, and received an acreage allotment of 67 acres for the next year. He would have to turn his tenants out. They have a right to make a living.

The purpose of the pending bill is fundamentally to remove such hardships and inequities, so that people can make a living in the production of cotton. The bill provides that the acreage shall go to the State on the basis of cotton producing history, and that the State committee shall have the first call on that acreage, to build up to 65 percent each farmer who has been reduced below that figure for the past 3 years of his average planting. I think it is a very wholesome measure.

In Mississippi we will get approximately 320,000 acres. It will require 150,000 acres to build up the allotments of farmers whose allotments have been reduced, to 65 percent of the average of their past 3 years planting.

Under the terms of the amendment submitted by my colleague [Mr. STENNIS] and myself, the next call on each State's additional acreage will be used to build up to 5 acres the allotment of the 5-acre farmer who did not secure sufficient acreage to give him the exemption to which the law declared he was entitled. In Mississippi that would require, roughly, 11,500 acres. In addition, there would be more than 100,000 acres for general distribution to the farmers of the State.

I think the bill would do a great amount of good. It would prevent the bankruptcy of thousands of farmers in the hill area of the State of Mississippi. While I do not go along with the idea of legislating economic advantage from one section of the country to the other, I was willing to support this proposal in order to relieve hardships in the case of thousands of growers in my own State.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Am I correct in understanding the distinguished Senator to say that under the increased allotment provided in the bill it would be possible, in the State of Mississippi, to give the farmers in the State sufficient additional acreage so that they would all have 65 percent of their 3-year average?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator not feel that there should be provision in the bill to do the same for other historic cotton producing States?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is a question of what has been learned from history. With respect to the State of Oklahoma, which is so ably represented in part by the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, the figures show that last year Oklahoma harvested 993,000 acres of cotton. In 1954 Oklahoma gets an allotment of 1,098,000 acres of cotton.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware of the fact that, on the one hand, a part of it cannot be used, and, on the other hand, the State would have to have an additional allotment of approximately 25,000 acres over and above what it will receive under the terms of the bill, in order for the same situation to prevail in Oklahoma as my good friend has indicated will prevail in his State?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know the facts about Oklahoma; but I know that if there is an allotment, it can certainly be used. Oklahoma secures an allotment roughly 100,000 acres greater than the acreage on which it harvested cotton last year.

Mr. KERR. Of course the Senator is aware of the terrific drought in Oklahoma in 1953, which prevented the harvesting of many acres of cotton which had been allotted and planted.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I know about the drought. I also know there was a drought in Mississippi, and I believe there was a drought in most of the other Southern States. The point is, even though they all suffered droughts, all of them have taken terrific reductions. Nevertheless the Senator's State gets an increase of 100,000 acres.

Mr. KERR. I desire to express my appreciation to my good friend from Mississippi for his statement. I am happy that the great State of Mississippi is faring as well as it is under the bill, because I would be just as much interested in the State of Mississippi as I am in the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly we are also interested in the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. However, I have the feeling that there is just as much reason why the bill should contain a provision which would permit the farmers of Oklahoma to have the two-thirds of the 3-year average, as there is for the other States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Every State has earned its allotment on the basis of history. Every Southern State stands on the same footing. Mississippi earned its acreage by planting it.

Mr. KERR. I am not objecting to Mississippi's allotment. I am merely asking that Oklahoma be as well off as is Mississippi, on the basis of the individual farmer.

Mr. EASTLAND. Historically that is the case.

Mr. KERR. It might appear so from what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has stated and believes to be the fact. However, from the standpoint of the individual allotments which have been made to the farmers and which will be followed under the bill if enacted into law, it does not work out that way.

Mr. EASTLAND. There are three States which certainly should have no complaint under the bill. One of the States is Oklahoma. Another is Arkansas, which last year harvested 1,849,000 acres of cotton. Under the pending bill Arkansas would be allotted 1,847,000 acres, which is a reduction of 2,000 acres. The remaining State is Missouri, which last year harvested 494,000 acres. In 1954 it would get an allotment of 462,000 acres.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Mississippi taking the position that the allotment for this year is based solely upon the amount of acreage the farmers were able to harvest in 1953?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I am not taking that position. It is based on history. It is based on what the States earned under the formula contained in the pending bill. There is one exception. It is the provision that no State shall be reduced more than 34 percent.

Mr. KERR. I understand. However, there is a further provision contained in the bill which, as I understand, would give to the individual farmer an amount equal to two-thirds of his 3-year average.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; if the acreage for the State will justify it; that is, if the State has earned sufficient acreage to justify its being done. In such a case the gadget is effective.

Mr. KERR. My good friend from Mississippi bases his statement on the record of 1953, which was adversely affected by one of the worst droughts Oklahoma has experienced, instead of the 3-year average, which is the basis of the allocation to the individual farmer.

Mr. EASTLAND. If Oklahoma is entitled to more acreage under the formula, Mississippi is also entitled to more acreage, as is Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I shall offer an amendment which will give additional acreage to Mississippi and Oklahoma and Georgia and Alabama.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator does so, it will probably result in a veto of the bill. When we were meeting with representatives of the Department of Agriculture we were given to understand that the proposed agreement is one which the administration will approve.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the Senator's point of view, but so far as the Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, he shall try to have enacted a bill which will take care of the situation in Oklahoma, even though the bill may be vetoed by both California and the White House.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know anything about that; but I do know that Oklahoma fares as well under this bill as does any other Southern State.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to point out the fact that on July 1, 1953, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which is the only authority we have on the subject, Oklahoma had 1,158,000 acres of cotton in cultivation. Under this bill it gets 1,098,283 acres. Perhaps that is not as much acreage as Oklahoma would like to have, but it is fair and reasonable on the basis of what all the other States had.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. The junior Senator from Texas would like to associate him-

self with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the committee on the bill which they have brought to the Senate. At the same time I wish to state, as has been stated by the Senators from South Carolina and Mississippi, that there are some provisions in the bill which we in Texas do not like. We hope the conference committee can make some improvements in it relating to the distribution within States and counties. However, because it is an emergency measure, and because of the fact that it has added to the total allotment in our State approximately 1,300,000 acres, I believe it to be in the best interest of the Senate to enact the bill and then permit the matters in disagreement to be worked out in conference. The junior Senator from Texas will support the pending legislation, and he congratulates the committee on the fine work it has done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say that I had hoped to mention the concluding sections of the bills and then to have statements by other Senators follow. It is difficult to yield back and forth during a discussion of the bill. However, I am glad to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to comment on one statement made by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. According to the report of the committee, on July 1 the acreage planted in Arkansas during 1953 was 2,112,000 acres. Under the bill the allotment to Arkansas would be 1,847,000 acres.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but Arkansas harvested 1,849,000 acres; as did Oklahoma.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] said with reference to our having suffered the misfortune of a severe drought. The Senator from Mississippi and other Senators have apparently made special dispensation for the benefit of the Far West. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico what the justification for it is. What is the justification for the two different gadgets in the bill, giving added acreage to his own State and to his neighbors, Arizona and California? In other words, why is not the bill based on the history of cotton production in all the States? Why did not the committee merely provide that the acreage which has been stated by the Secretary of Agriculture as being permitted—and there is some difference of opinion as to the interpretation—is hereby raised to 21 million acres, and the distribution would be followed upon the basis of history?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can give only my own answer to the Senator's question, and I shall not presume to speak for the States of Arizona and California. If the Secretary of Agriculture wishes to take Public Law 272, which was Senate bill 1962, as introduced by me in the Senate in 1949, and which became the law of the land, and will follow its provisions exactly in the 1954 growing season, I would support him, and so would the farmers in my State. It would mean a reduction in the production of cotton this year by approximately 2½ million bales, and would give an opportunity for quotas to be taken off by the end of 1955, and possibly by the end of 1954.

A strict application of that law would very substantially reduce the amount of cotton produced in a single year. The Western States expand very rapidly in their cotton production, because they have a very easy way of producing it. They have good, flat, level land and are able to use cottonpickers and four-row cultivators and many other devices, so that the acreage expands rapidly in those areas.

But it was felt that the reduction was too great. The Secretary of Agriculture went to the conference of southern Governors and said he would recommend that the national acreage be increased to approximately 21 million acres. We felt that a bill which took a recognition of the factor of growth in those western areas was not an improper bill. The original bill, introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], provided that no cut should be more than 25 percent. That matter went to a conference of cotton-producing States and an attempt was made to reach a compromise. It was not agreed to at Fort Worth, and it went before a meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, where a compromise was suggested that no cut would be more than 27½ percent. All but two States seemed well satisfied with the maximum of 27½ percent.

The percentage mentioned did not apply to New Mexico because it has reduced its acreage as the Secretary requested.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All the other States did that.

Mr. ANDERSON. There were efforts made to compromise it again, and a figure of 29½ percent was suggested. That was provided, I believe, in the House bill. The maximum cut that could be made in any State was 29½ percent. Here the maximum cut is 34 percent, which we thought was a very reasonable and fair adjustment of the situation.

All I say is that if the proposed legislation should be killed, no State would be allowed to produce more than the amount of cotton which is required to make 10 million bales. I think approximately 17 million acres is more than sufficient to produce 10 million bales. I have never questioned it, but if the national acreage were cut down to 17,910,000 acres only for 1954, my State would be highly pleased.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator apparently did not understand me. I was not making the point that it should not be 21 million acres, although I think there is doubt that that much is required. I am asking why California and Arizona are given special consideration. They are given a far greater participation than are the other States. I understood the Senator to intimate a moment ago that there were some special factors making it difficult to reduce acreage in California. I want the Senator to explain why. I do not understand why it is more difficult for California to reduce acreage than it is for Arkansas and Mississippi to reduce acreage.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are getting into questions that I did not think we would get into.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from New Mexico is the most knowledgeable man with reference to agriculture in the Senate. If he cannot answer my question, no one else can.

Mr. ANDERSON. A piece of land in California on which water has not previously been put can be irrigated so that cotton can be grown upon it. Cotton can be grown with an expenditure of 2½ acre-feet of water, whereas alfalfa may require 3 or 4 acre-feet of water. To cultivate alfalfa instead of cotton it is necessary to redesign the pumps, change the capacity of the concrete ditches, and change the rapidity with which the water flows across the land. The cultivation of alfalfa is entirely different from the cultivation of cotton.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With reference to cotton, the expenditures are made on a basis wholly different from those made in connection with some other crop.

Mr. ANDERSON. The situation in irrigated areas is wholly different from that in the rain belt. The question of the size of the pump is involved, where it should be installed, and how rapidly the water should flow down the ditches and onto the land. So it is a much more expensive proposition. It requires a very greatly increased initial investment. In the opinion of the farmers, it is a very hazardous thing. One of the reasons why I think the western farmers are entitled to special consideration is that if cotton quotas had been proclaimed for 1953 as the supply situation seemed to require, many of these investments would not have been made. They were made, and it is pretty serious to impair them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. As soon as I have concluded with the question asked by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That brings up a question which I think the Senate ought to know about. There is an implication from the Senator's remarks that there is hardship on the farmers, as he calls them. Is it not a fact that the largest operators in California and Arizona are not farmers in the sense of farmers in my State, but are huge corporations? Is it not a fact that a special tax dispensation was given to those corporations for the very purpose for which we are now proposing to reimburse them with extra acreage? Were they not given special tax dispensations, and is it not a fact that the Anderson, Clayton & Co. and its subsidiary, the Western Cotton Oil Co., have certificates of $15,791,000 for the purpose of recompensing them for at least a part of the expenditures which the Senator has mentioned? Is not that true?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is in the record, I believe.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not familiar with the situation except to the extent that I have been on the ranch in California which was purchased by the Anderson, Clayton & Co. I do not know anything about the tax amortization. The only tax amortization which they could get would be for the construction of gins or compresses to take care of the cotton production of all California farms, not only their own.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator tell me how many acres the Anderson-Clayton Co. and its subsidiaries have?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I cannot. At one time I saw a news story in California identifying me as a partner of Will Clayton. I am deeply regretful that that rumor is not correct. I do not know anything about their income. I only wish I had half of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not see the statement to which the Senator has referred, but I certainly had no intention of leaving any such impression. I have in my hand data which I believe to be correct and which I shall offer for the record a little later on, showing that there was not a single tax dispensation made in any State east of the Mississippi River; at least, not in my State. The only States given such special treatment were Arizona, New Mexico, California, and Texas. The certification was for a total amount of more than $30 million.

I am not making an attack on New Mexico. All I am trying to bring out is the fact that there is no reason to give special treatment to California and Arizona, which are the principal beneficiaries of this bill. I am not complaining about the 21 million acres. I see no justification at all for the special treatment. They were given special tax treatment for added expenditures they made. Not only were they compensated in that way, but we all know they have had extremely profitable operations during the past 3 years. We have only to look at the Anderson-Clayton stock on the stock exchange to see how it has gyrated.

In the State of California there are only 8,000 farmers who produce cotton, as compared with 100,000 in the State of Arkansas. Yet, as the figures clearly indicate, $30 million dispensations, $30 million tax certificates, were issued, and $15,791,000 were to this one great corporation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Every nickel of that is for amortization on cotton gins and cotton processing, and has nothing to do with the business of farming. Not a nickel of it went to a farmer in the State of California.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think farmers in the Arkansas delta would not agree that cotton ginning has nothing to do with cotton farming. I think the Senate ought to be told how many acres in the States receiving special consideration are going to the large corporations, because Congress legislates not simply for business. It must take into consideration all those who are engaged in this industry. If it is only a question of the amount of cotton which should be grown, I suppose we ought to abolish all the poor farmers in the South. But that has not been the purpose of such legislation in the past. I do not see any justification for the special acreage allotment to the 3 Western States which are involved in 2 of the gadgets in the pending bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not have the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Am I to understand the theory of the Senator from Arkansas to be that the normal economic development which has taken place in various areas of the country should be interfered with by Government action?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, indeed. The Senator from California completely misunderstands my point. My point is that a bill was agreed to by the people of the Senator's State and the people of other States, setting up a formula for the allocation of cotton planting. That was done in 1950, and it is proposed to do it again, but now it is desired to change the formula. I see no reason why it is necessary to change the formula. We have already had interference with normal cotton growing under the provisions of the old bill. All I am complaining about is that in so-called emergency legislation, which we have before us so suddenly, it is necessary to proceed to change the formula.

The only fair way to proceed is to use exactly the same basis for allocating acreage, in this case perhaps 21 million acres, as was provided in the previous law, on which our cotton-producing history was built. Now it is proposed to change the basis in so-called emergency legislation. I can see no justification for special treatment being given to 3 States, especially to 2 of those States. I agree that the State of New Mexico gets a very very small bite under this proposal. The greater part, of course, goes to Arizona and California. I do not see any reason for it. If there is economic justification, or any other justification under the basic history of the last 5 years, in due course those States will get the benefits for what they planted in 1953.

What is sought to be done by this bill is to step up the benefits and to give special privileges. I do not see the justification for it. Certainly there is no justification from a humanitarian point of view, the point of view of trying to help people. The principal beneficiaries obviously are huge corporations which have gone into those States, and, because of their tremendous financial capacity, have been able to bring this acreage up from under 600,000 acres in 1950 to 1,400,000 acres. Compare that with the acreage in the other States.

Who is it that is making the largest contribution to the tremendous surplus which is worrying everyone? It is the same States who are the beneficiaries of these special gadgets. I see no reason to grant special privilege to increase acreage for their benefit by the terms of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I presume the distinguished Senator from Arkansas knows that the State of California is taking a most substantial cut under the whole plan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not according to the historical basis, but only when we consider the production of last year, which is not the basis of the legislation on which we have been proceeding for several years. In other words, by this bill we are changing the basic rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are not changing a single basic rule. We are altering for 1954 only the pattern, but the basic law will remain the same. That is one thing we are trying to preserve.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the question raised by the Senator from Arkansas, does not the Senator from New Mexico believe it would be a good idea to place in the RECORD at this point the letter addressed by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under date of December 14, 1953, setting forth the Secretary's reasons for believing an increase of 3 million acres planted in cotton would be highly desirable?

I may say further that the bill was written as it is because the committee believed that a reduction of more than 34 percent in cotton acreage in 1 year would be injurious to a number of States, and no less injurious to California, New Mexico, and Arizona than it would be to South Carolina, Arkansas, Texas, or any other State.

Speaking of special privilege, I may further point out that there was an area, including virtually all the State of Oklahoma, portions of the Panhandle of Texas, some of Arkansas, and possibly portions of New Mexico, although I do not believe there was much in New Mexico, where in 1951 there was a heavy abandonment of acreage of winter wheat, and thousands upon thousands of acres abandoned to wheat were planted to cotton. Now we come to a year when we have acreage allocations for both wheat and cotton. Certain areas are privileged to count the same acres twice in figuring their allotments for both wheat and cotton for this year. If we are going to do away with all special privilege, we should take care of such a situation as that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I to understand that the Secretary of Agriculture recommended a special privilege for California?

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided that 34 percent——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, no. The Senator from Vermont has a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture. Did the Secretary recommend a special privilege for California?

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, the Secretary of Agriculture has not recommended special privileges for anyone.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand why the committee has done so.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has not done so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the justification for the California allocation? I have not yet heard it.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has great regard for the economy of the entire country and for the producers of every commodity, wherever they may be located. Does the Senator from Arkansas believe that restricting cotton acreage reduction to 34 percent for any one area of the country is wrong?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. California was aware of the law, and agreed to it when it was passed, and California was given special tax dispensation for investments made in facilities there.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Arkansas advocate recommitting the bill and letting the law stand as it is? Why does not the Senator move to recommit the bill and let everyone go back to the present law if he likes it so well?

All the Senator needs to do is to move to recommit the bill, and he will have a law already in existence with which he is perfectly well satisfied.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that is an answer to my inquiry with respect to the justification of special acreage. If California is to take that attitude, I think the Senator from Arkansas is entitled to know what reasons motivated the committee to grant this privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Without objection, the request of the Senator from Vermont tc have printed in the RECORD the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture is granted.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 14, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: On October 9, pursuant to provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, I announced a national cotton marketing quota of 10 million (500-pound gross weight) bales and a national cotton acreage allotment of 17,910,448 acres for the 1954 crop. I acted in accordance with the legislative provisions of the act and had no authority to adjust or change the quota level or the acreage allotment specified to produce cotton at the quota level.

On several recent occasions I have expressed my great concern over this severe production adjustment with its attendant hardship on many farmers, and in fact on the whole Cotton Belt economy. I have also publicly indicated that I would urge Congress to make a reasonable increase in the minimum national marketing quota specified in the act for the year 1954, so that the adjustment of cotton supplies could be spread out over 2 or more years instead of attempting to accomplish it within a single year.

The basic work in establishing individual farm cotton acreage allotments has proceeded to the point where it is abundantly clear that the currently announced national acreage allotment will result in grossly inequitable farm acreage allotments in many cases. If the allotments remain unchanged they will create undue hardship for many cotton farmers, as well as other segments of the cotton industry.

An appraisal of the program as developed to date indicates that an additional 3 million acres would make it possible to substantially correct the more serious inequities in individual farm acreage allotments, and to bring such allotments more nearly in line with plantings in recent years. A national allotment of this size, when adjusted for historical underplanting and normal abandonment, could be expected with average harvested yields of the past 5 years to produce about 10.5 million bales of cotton. A crop of this size should result in a material reduction in our cotton stocks. Thus, even with the proposed increase in the national allotment, a good start would be made toward adjusting cotton supplies.

I, therefore, desire to recommend to the Congress that action be taken at the earliest possible date to increase the 1954 cotton acreage allotment to 21 million acres, thus providing latitude for correcting individual farm hardship cases. I also recommend that this additional acreage be apportioned to farms in such a way as to correct substantially the more serious inequities in individual farm acreage allotments.

I have expressed regret that producers had not previously reached agreement on the apportionment of an increase in the national allotment, in order to facilitate the necessary action by Congress. While I have not had an opportunity to examine the proposal, I understand that representatives of major cotton producer groups have now reached general agreement on these questions. This is a very encouraging development and seems to be very much in accord with our thinking on the subject. The Department of Agriculture will support the provisions of such an agreement if it will lessen the hardship of severe acreage reductions, provide an equitable basis for the apportionment of the increased allotment among individual farms, and still provide for a reduction in total cotton supplies.

The Department is gathering detailed information on the currently authorized farm allotments. It expects to be in position by the time Congress reconvenes to recommend specific amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act which will carry out the broad policy recommendations made above.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, who has been seeking recognition.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in an effort to attempt to answer some of the questions propounded by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, I wish to state, with respect to Arizona, if the matter were left to what the Senator terms large cotton interests—and he has not mentioned all of them—those whom the Senator mentioned are not land owners; they are ginners.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator stating that they own no cotton-producing facilities?

Mr. GOLDWATER. They are not large owners of cotton-producing facilities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator place in the RECORD the number of acres they control?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not have that information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then how does the Senator know they are not large producers?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am attempting to answer the basic question of the Senator from Arkansas. If it were up to the people who are termed large cotton growers in the State, of whom there are substantial numbers, I agree they would be unanimously in favor of retaining the restriction of 17,900,000 acres, because if they should go through, as they would be able to do this year, with a low amount of cotton planting next year, it would bring a tidal wave of cotton in the Southwestern area, and in the next period of allocation the Southern States, and the Senator's own State, would suffer from it.

This action, of course, was asked and suggested by the Farm Bureau, and agreed to by the Senators and Representatives from the States of New Mexico, Arizona, California, and also Texas, because there are a large number of small planters in new producing areas of those States. Consider, for instance, the southwestern area of Arizona, under the project called the Welton-Mohawk, which came into being only last year. We need 22,000 acres of land available for cultivation this year.

We find in the southeastern section of Arizona, in Cochise County, a similar situation, where the cultivation of cotton has a history of only a year or two. Arizona, California, New Mexico, have had a history of growing cotton that extends back, in any substantial amount, only to about 1950. With the start of the war our country needed more cotton than the South and the State about which the Senator from Arkansas is concerned could produce, so the Government went and urged the farmers to the west in increase the planting of cotton.

Our land can produce cotton at remarkably low rates. In Texas it can be produced at 13½ cents a pound, in Arizona at 20 cents, which is substantially lower than it can be produced for elsewhere in the United States.

Eventually, no matter how we may word the law, no matter how much our distinguished friends from the South like it or dislike it, the production of cotton is going to move to the Southwest and the West because of the cheapness of production costs. Likewise, we in the West, who have been producing cattle are resigned to the fact that ultimately the rich States of the South will produce much of the cattle we have been producing in our section.

I merely desired to explain that this request for a small increase of acreage is on behalf of the little growers in Arizona and California.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Arkansas will not have any confusion in his mind as to what the bill would accomplish, and will realize that every dollar of money he is talking about relates to tax-amortization concessions made in order to bring gins and compresses into areas in the West.

The Anderson, Clayton & Co., as I recall the situation on the ranch referred to, grows cotton on about 20,000 acres out of 1,400,000 acres in the State of California. If the cotton acreage should be cut down greatly, as would be done under the existing law, Anderson-Clayton could stand it because it has many other sources of income. But the small farmers would be in trouble. I have met some of the farmers in California in the past few months—supplementing the remarks which the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the junior

Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] have made—and I know that if the national quota is left at 10 million bales, as the present law requires, the large corporations that have one or two tracts are not going to worry about it, but the farmers who are in desperate need because they are small operators are going to be in great distress.

I do not believe there is a dollar in that list that the Senator from Arkansas referred to that ever went into the development of cotton acreage. The money that Anderson-Clayton paid was paid for a developed ranch, including 2,000 acres in melons, and that has nothing to do with ginning operations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, 58 of the gins of the Anderson, Clayton & Co. and the Western Cotton Oil Co. were, of course, granted accelerated amortization. Of a total of 133 for the States of California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, 58 were granted to Anderson-Clayton and its subsidiary, the Western Cotton Oil Co., which would indicate they have a very substantial acreage. I have tried to find out what the acreage is, but apparently that is a great secret. In my opinion, the committee ought to be able to tell the Senate just what the situation is.

I am leading up to the point that Senators keep talking about the small farmers in Arizona and California. Of course, there are small farmers in Arkansas, in Georgia, and everywhere else. Does the Senator know what the average acreage is per farmer or per voter in California?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, but it is very substantially larger.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is about four times as much; is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not try to give the figure, because I do not know it. But I point out that the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] brought out before the committee a few days ago that there were 18 counties in his State in which not a single farmer got more than the allotment. That would be unheard of in the West. In the State of California a man who wanted to operate 5 acres would be committed to an insane asylum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think 35 acres is the average in California, and 44 in Arizona. Senators come before us and base their case on the hardship imposed on various farmers. Of course, conditions are hard on everyone, but relatively how do Senators make a case for any special privileges to a State which has an average of 44 acres per voter as compared with a State with an average of 5 acres, as I believe the figure is in Mississippi? I think it is 12-plus, nearly 13, in Arkansas. That is a third or fourth as many.

If we are to take action based on concern for the individual, we can make a better case. We can ask special privileges in Arkansas. I am only opposing giving special privileges and dispensations to States which need them least of all. Based on the statistics and the figures which I read in the hearings, the last places which really need special privilege are California or Arizona. They have already the largest cotton acreage per person. As we have been told just now by the Senator from Arizona, they can produce cotton very economically. There is some question about that, incidentally. We have to evaluate how much the Federal Government has poured in. I would certainly file a caveat that they cannot produce it cheaper than it is produced in our good delta country, if the special privileges are equalized.

I am not trying to have taken away from the States anything that belongs to them according to the law under which we have been living for the past several years. The only thing I am asking is why they cannot live under the same law. I think they can. I think they are better off today per capita or in any other way; I know they are. I have not heard any justification in fact for a special privilege to these three States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, one of the factors in the consideration given Western States was that if we turn loose a million acres in California and Arizona of higher production land, and throw it into alfalfa, we can calculate pretty well what the alfalfa price will be across the country. If we throw it into potatoes, we know what would happen to the potato producers across this Nation. Large groups discussed this at Forth Worth and Chicago, and what we did was based on our desire to keep Arizona and California from entering into competition with the other States which are producing crops already near a surplus position.

I again wish to say that the whole story of the acreage in California owned by the large corporation would not be very difficult to obtain. Although I do not know the operations of Anderson, Clayton & Co. as well as I should, yet I feel reasonably safe in saying that Anderson, Clayton & Co. do not plant more than 20,000 acres of cotton in any State. In all the States put together, I believe the only large cotton plantation they have is the one in California; and I believe they bought it to keep that cotton from going to a rival gin.

I yield now to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, as a new Senator I should like to tell my colleagues in the Senate how deeply appreciative I am of the cooperation of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who formed a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in discussing and working on this entire cotton question.

A year ago I introduced a piece of legislation at the request of the cotton growers in California. They were apprehensive that at the next planting the Secretary of Agriculture would announce an allotment which would restrict the acreage in California perhaps by as much as one-half. As a matter of fact, when the acreage allotments were made, the result was a cut of more than one-half in California.

At that time the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the proposed legislation I had introduced, but did not approve it.

Meanwhile, with cotton quotas being put into effect across the entire cotton belt, the Secretary of Agriculture requested emergency legislation at this session. I believe I can tell you, Mr. President, that one of my memories of the time I have spent in the Senate will be that of sitting in a subcommittee, listening to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and seeing them write what I am sure constitutes the best type of compromise legislation in a very difficult situation.

I listened to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] state a few moments ago that the cotton acreage in California was controlled by big business. I deny that, Mr. President.

I wish to indicate one figure which I believe will bear somewhat upon the subject. In 1950, when the Secretary of Agriculture proclaimed cotton quotas in the United States, 9,684 farms in California were given allotments. One thousand, two hundred and seventy-seven farms of that number represented allotments to cotton farms of 5 acres or less.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator from California tell the Senate how many acres Anderson, Clayton & Co. and its subsidiaries farm and control in California?

Mr. KUCHEL. I regret to state to the Senator from California that I do not have that particular statistic; but if he deems it relevant, I shall be glad to obtain it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do think it is relevant. I tried to obtain it from the Department of Agriculture, but no one there could supply it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me say that I do not believe it is a figure with which the Department of Agriculture concerns itself. The Department does not go around inquiring about the ownership of tracts of land.

But I believe that the Anderson-Clayton firm owns and controls approximately 38,000 acres of land of all kinds in California. Approximately 20,000 acres of it go into the production of cotton; about 2,000 acres of it normally go into the production of melons; and the rest in alfalfa. That was the pattern the last time I drove by the farm, and I believe it is the only farm owned by that company.

I have said that I know something of the reason which compelled that company to buy that farm.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does that include the Western Cotton Oil Co.?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when the allotments were made, acreage in California was cut more than one-half. I believe that represents a potential loss to the economy of California of between $150 million and $200 million.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. No, Mr. President; I prefer to conclude my very brief statement. I shall not speak very long.

I am sure it seemed to the subcommittee that it would not be proper to prepare a bill under which some States would suffer, as in the case of Arkansas, approximately 10 percent, whereas other States would suffer a vastly greater amount.

Finally, on the recommendation of the farmers of the United States, the subcommittee recommended that no State should be cut more than 34 percent. And that is what the bill before the Senate provides.

Only two States—namely, Arizona and California—would benefit by that provision. That is another way of saying that no State affected by the proposed legislation with which we deal today would have a cut of more than 34 percent in its cotton economy.

Mr. President, how else can we find a basis upon which to write a fair piece of legislation of this kind? If anyone were to object, if anyone were to offer amendments to this bill, it seems to me it should be either the Senators from Arizona or the Senators from California, the States that are cut 34 percent under this measure. Yet I am glad to say that the Senators from Arizona and the Senators from California are satisfied with what is a fair and just compromise, and will support it as a 1-year emergency stopgap bill. They hope that the amendments which will be offered on the floor will be rejected in their entirety.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield at this time for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a moment ago the senior Senator from Oklahoma attempted to ask me a question. I must confess that subsequently I forgot about it, and yielded to other Senators.

At this time I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a question, or I shall be glad to yield the floor, as he may prefer.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question or two.

I should like to say that I am seeking information. I tried to ask the Senator from Arizona a question, but he declined to yield. Then I tried to ask the Senator from California a question, but he declined to yield.

So I am very grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for yielding for a question or two.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. In order that the RECORD may be clear as to the meaning of certain provisions of the bill, I should like to ask some questions relative to the release and reallocation of acreage, both as to the manner and as to the timing.

Beginning in line 20, on page 3 of the bill, we find the following:

(2) Any part of any 1954 farm cotton acreage allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable—

On a certain basis.

Does the Senator from New Mexico believe it is accurate to interpret that provision to mean that such voluntary surrender by one farmer to the county committee may be made at any time up to the end of planting time for that county?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I so interpret it; and I would call his attention to the fact that in 1950 an almost identical hardship provision was written into the bill then pending. Under its terms, several hundred thousand acres of cotton land were temporarily surrendered to the county committees, and were reallocated by the county committees to farms requiring additional acreage. No time limit was specified in the bill then; and for the sake of the legislative intent, let us say that no time limit is specified in this bill. It can be done any time by the individual farmer surrendering the acreage to the county committee; and it may be reallocated by the county committee at any time prior to planting.

Mr. KERR. To other farmers within the county.

Mr. ANDERSON. To other farmers in the county having allotments.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Reading further from page 4, beginning at line 5:

If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered is not needed in the county, the county committee may surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if he would interpret that language to mean that the surrender of unused acreage back to the State by the counties, and the reallocation by the State to other counties within the State, would also be without time limit, in the year for which the allocation is made.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that that also is without time limit. A special provision was written into the 1949 act for the State of Oklahoma, because it had an unusual problem. The planting of cotton was shifting from one area of the State to another, as the distinguished Senator well knows. Had this provision been in the law at that time, it would not have been necessary to allow Oklahoma to have a special 15-percent reserve, because counties not using the acreage could have surrendered it, and it could have been used by the other counties. However, at that time this provision had not been thought of, and Oklahoma could not do that. Therefore it was necessary to give Oklahoma special consideration, because of the transfer of cotton production from one end of the State to the other.

It is the intention of this provision to make possible the very thing which was needed in Oklahoma at that time, and which, in my opinion, is needed in Texas now. I do not think the Senators from Texas agree with me completely as to how much could be transferred, but I think a fairly large acreage could be transferred there. No effort is made to establish any time limit whatever.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for his answer. I appreciate his tribute to the distinguished former Senator from Oklahoma who, in 1949, was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I must say that in the opinion of the present senior Senator from Oklahoma, if we had a member on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1954, Oklahoma might come as near being a special beneficiary of the act as the senior Senator from Oklahoma thinks California is. I was addressing my questions to the meaning of the proposed legislation in 1954, which, as I understand, is applicable to all the States.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask one further question in that connection.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was not trying to say that Oklahoma received preferential treatment in 1949. It had a problem, and the Congress tried very hard to meet that problem by providing that Oklahoma might set aside a 15 percent reserve, as against a 10 percent reserve somewhere else, not as something which was preferential, but something which was required by the facts of life within that individual State.

Mr. KERR. As I recall, under that provision Oklahoma did not receive an additional allotment not participated in, on the basis of the historical background, by all other States.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Would the Senator's interpretation as to the surrender by farmers within the county for reallocation within the county and also by counties back to the States, followed by reallocation by the State committee within the State, apply equally to all the cotton acreage allocated to the State, as well as to the additional acreage provided for in this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have my own opinion, and I am reinforced by the legislative counsel for the committee. My opinion is that it applies to all of it.

Mr. KERR. That is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. ANDERSON. If we are in agreement on that point, we have almost fixed the legislative history.

Mr. KERR. I wanted to be sure that the RECORD disclosed that that was the interpretation of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma that that was the intent of the committee.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that answer.

I should like to ask the Senator one further question, which does not relate to information about the bill.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma, in listening to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] a while ago, thought he understood the Senator from Arizona to say that the allocations in this bill were as requested and agreed to by the Farm Bureau Federation. Did the Senator from New Mexico hear that statement by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I heard the statement. I shall not try to interpret it.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ANDERSON. As a matter of fact, many conferences have been held. There was a conference held at Fort Worth, which was sponsored, I believe, by the Farm Bureau Federation. There was a subsequent conference to which, for obvious reasons, I was not invited. It was not held by Farm Bureau groups, but by another group, who were trying to alter some things which some of us had planned. There was a subsequent meeting held in Chicago by the Farm Bureau Federation.

Many persons have tried their best to arrive at a solution for this problem. There was an approval of this particular method by the Farm Bureau Federation. I mention that fact because the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and I had some discussion on the subject, and we arrived at a formula not quite the same as that in the bill. Our formula did not include additional acreage for Arizona and California by limiting reductions to 34 percent. It is interesting to note that it was as a result of efforts by Members from Southern States that the decision to give additional acreage to California and Arizona was written into the act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the Senator's statement. Does he mean to say that the idea of a special allotment for certain States originated with Members from the Southern States?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I say that when the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi, and I tried to reach an understanding, it was decided that there would be 21 million acres, plus the hardship allowance of 1½ percent. That decision was transmitted to a meeting in Chicago attended by Farm Bureau representatives from all the cotton-producing States. The States of Arizona and California were greatly outnumbered. The proposal now before the Senate, providing that there shall be no cut greater than 34 percent, came out of that meeting, in which, as I say, a great many Southern States were represented. I therefore feel that they were entirely satisfied with that proposal.

I should like to conclude my discussion with respect to section 4. Does the Senator from Arkansas have any questions as to that section?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to have any misapprehension left in the RECORD. I wish only to say that I do not believe that the cotton producers of my State feel that they agreed to the provision with respect to a special acreage for California. It is not my impression that they feel they agreed. I do not know whether the Senator is saying that in his opinion they agreed.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be happy to have the Senator correct me if my statement is not accurate. I think the decision of the Farm Bureau meeting in Chicago on this subject was unanimous. There was no conflicting opinion when they finally came to the settlement of it. Walter Randolph appeared before our committee as the representative of the Farm Bureau, and he voiced no objection to this provision. In fact, he supported it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He is not from my State.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. He is from Alabama, but he represented all the Farm Bureau organizations. I did not mean to go into that question. I meant only to say that there were Senators from Southern States on the committee. They tried to solve this problem in what they considered to be an equitable fashion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. One point has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas which we have failed to clear up, and which I believe should be cleared up for the record. There is the possibility that his remarks with respect to tax amortization privileges might be construed as applying to the land. I should like to make it clear that they do not apply to the land. Tax amortization certificates have been issued to cotton ginners and oil processors in the West. In the East similar certificates have been issued applying to other phases of agriculture. I did not wish to leave any misapprehension in the RECORD.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas mentioned special privileges accorded to cotton growers of Arizona, California, and New Mexico. I did not want the tax amortization privileges to be included among them. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has visited Arizona repeatedly. He is one of the most welcome visitors we have. I am sure he refers to the special privilege our farmers enjoy because of the delightful sunshine, the fine weather, and the pleasant and industrious people who live in that State. I am sure he does not intend at all to allude to any special grants from the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to finish with section 4 of the bill. Section 4 relates to the potato situation. In a joint resolution passed by Congress either in 1949 or 1950 provision was made that unless the potato growers adopted a system of controls they would not be eligible for price supports on potatoes. I must plead guilty to having drawn up the original amendment. It was offered by the former Senator from Illinois, Mr. Lucas. It was subsequently supported by many Senators, and I believe the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] finally introduced the successful joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New Mexico is mistaken in that regard. The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced the joint resolution. He was joined in its introduction by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDERSON. I apologize to the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, provision was made that price supports could not be given to the growers of potatoes. In presenting the joint resolution it was not the intention that the Secretary of Agriculture should not have the right to make use of section 32 funds. We never dreamed that could happen until an interpretation was made by the Department of Agriculture to the effect that the joint resolution forbade the use of section 32 funds. Therefore, the pending bill contains a provision making it possible to use section 32 funds for supporting the price of Irish potatoes.

Mr. KERR and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, inasmuch as my name has been mentioned, I am sure the Senator from New Mexico will recall that we tried to amend the law so as to leave discretionary power in the hands of the Secretary with respect to potatoes; but because of the insistence of the Senators from the potato-growing States that a mandatory provision should be enacted into law, the joint resolution referred to was finally adopted in the present form of the law. We would have readily agreed to discretionary power.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from New Mexico referred to section 32 funds. Can he tell the Senate how much money is available in that fund?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will be able to tell the Senator in a moment. I believe it is approximately $400 million.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator also able to refresh our memory as to the percentage of that fund which the law pertaining to it permits the Secretary to use with reference to any commodity which is available to be supported by such funds?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not certain, but I believe it is 25 percent.

Mr. KERR. Then under section 4 of the pending bill the Secretary of Agriculture would be permitted to use up to $100 million in supporting the price of Irish potatoes. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe that is correct. However, he would be restricted by the provision that he could buy only what he could readily dispose of.

Mr. KERR. Does the section provide how the Secretary of Agriculture may readily dispose of the potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I have the answer to the Senator's previous question. I have before me the Department of Agriculture handbook. It states that under section 32 the amount of money available is $402,200,000. My answer with respect to 25 percent is correct.

Mr. KERR. The bill contains the provision that in 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use $100,500,000 to support the price of Irish potatoes. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe theoretically he could do so. I do not believe that practically it could be done.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from New Mexico explain why the Secretary could not do so?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because I do not believe any Secretary of Agriculture would hold that he could buy $100 million worth of Irish potatoes and dispose of them advantageously.

Mr. KERR. But it would be within his legal authority to do so if the bill became law?

Mr. ANDERSON. If he should follow the criterion set up in the bill, it would be in his power to do so.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from New Mexico enlighten the Senate as to what part of a cotton-emergency measure section 4 is, inasmuch as it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to spend $100 million in 1954 to support the price of Irish potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not a part of the cotton-emergency measure. The Senator is getting onto ground that probably we should not be entering. I suggested in committee the subject should be treated in a separate bill. On the other hand, the interpretation of the Department of Agriculture was obviously contrary to what Congress intended, so I agreed with others to put it in this bill. I firmly believe that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority now to spend and can spend, up to $100 million. The Solicitor General does not agree with me. Realizing that he is a lawyer and I am not, I thought it would be desirable to correct the situation in the pending legislation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico admit that the proposed section 4 has nothing whatever to do with the emergency situation with reference to cotton acreage and cotton planting this year?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will admit it.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator feel, insofar as germaneness and applicability are concerned, that an amendment to the bill requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of beef cattle on the hoof at 90 percent would be just as much a part of the cotton-emergency bill as is the provision with reference to Irish potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I would not agree, because I believe in my own heart that Congress never intended to take away from the Secretary of Agriculture the right to use section 32 funds to support the price of Irish potatoes. I believe Congress did not intend to do it, and that the interpretation made by the Department of Agriculture is a little bit on the whimsical side, to say the least. I thought perhaps it was desirable, if the Secretary of Agriculture did not want to do it, to say that he did not have the authority. I believe he does have the authority.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would like to aline himself with the Senator from New Mexico in acknowledging the possibility of whimsical action on the part of the Department of Agriculture as now constituted. However, I do not believe the Senator understood my question. If he understood it, I do not believe he answered it. I asked him, insofar as the provisions of law are concerned, whether it would not be just as applicable to amend the emergency cotton acreage allotment bill so as to provide mandatory provisions to support the price of beef cattle, as it is to authorize the expenditure of $100 million now on hand for the support of the price of Irish potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I tried to answer it by saying that a proposal requiring the Secretary of Agriculture in mandatory fashion to support the price of beef cattle at 90 percent of parity in my opinion is quite different from a provision which permits him to do what I believe he already has the power to do.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator admit that such an amendment would be just as much in order as section 4 of the pending bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it would be in order; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator permit me to make a brief statement on the background of the potato amendment?

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has asked that he be allowed to yield the floor. I am perfectly willing to yield to other Senators, but I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from New Mexico would yield to me for two very brief questions, which I believe he can answer immediately. I should like to have the answers for my own information.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to yield to other Senators when I have completed my statement.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I were the joint authors of the amendment in its final form which struck out the provision in the then existing law for the support of Irish potatoes.

It was our intention simply to strike out the possibility of any further support-price program as that term is generally recognized—a mandatory price-support program or any other price-support program in the normal usage of the term—and there was no intention whatever to strike Irish potatoes off the list of agricultural commodities or to put them under different treatment from other commodities which are entitled to the use of portions of section 32 funds whenever surpluses should justify that use under other provisions of law.

So, Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] came before the committee, stating that the potato producers of Idaho did have surplus production of potatoes this year which they wanted to have handled under the school-lunch program or some other similar program, and had been confronted with a ruling by a former solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, to the effect that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana and myself was so broad as to prevent that use, we both felt, and the committee felt, that there was no such reasonable interpretation to be placed upon our amendment, and that by all means Irish potatoes ought to be restored to the list of agricultural commodities and be given the same right which every other agricultural commodity has under the law for the use, if needed, of portions of section 32 funds.

Therefore, this amendment is in the bill. It was simply to place Irish potatoes in the same position as livestock and other agricultural crops. The largest amount of recent use of such funds has been for the livestock industry, and the purpose of this amendment is to permit Irish potatoes to regain and retake their place in the list of agricultural commodities which are entitled to relief through section 32 funds.

As to the amount, every other agricultural commodity stands on the same basis, and there is no more reason for assuming that the full $100 million, if that is 25 percent of the total, would be used on Irish potatoes than there would be that it is to be used in full on citrus or prunes or raisins or apples or peaches or pears or any of the other numerous commodities where section 32 funds have been used.

The whole result of the amendment would simply be to restore Irish potatoes to their rightful place with reference to the use of section 32 funds in the family of agricultural products, so that they would at least have equal standing in connection with the use of some of the section 32 funds to relieve their distress.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to yield so that the Senator from Oklahoma may ask a question.

Mr. KERR. As I understood the Senator from Florida, he said that section 32 funds were being used for the livestock industry.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator explain what he had reference to, so that I may

acquire some information which I do not now have?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood that a very substantial amount of those funds had been used with respect to the purchase of canned meat for the direct purpose of assisting the livestock industry. I have in my office a statement of the total amount used. I do not recall the amount at the moment, but it was quite large. My statement was to remind the Senator from Oklahoma, if he had forgotten it, that the livestock industry is already on terms of parity with every other agricultural commodity, insofar as the use of section 32 funds is concerned, with the sole exception of Irish potatoes, and the purpose of the amendment is to restore Irish potatoes to the position from which it should never have been taken.

Mr. KERR. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator that if he is referring to the $100 million which the Secretary has spent for hamburger meat and canned meat, it has been for the benefit of the packers and not for the benefit of meat producers.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from New Mexico will yield further, I should like to say that I do not care to enter into any argument with the Senator from Oklahoma as to the result of the investment of section 32 funds. My statement was, and it continues to be, that the largest amount of section 32 funds expended this past year have been in the effort to help the livestock industry in connection with products of the livestock industry, and the result of the amendment in the committee bill relative to Irish potatoes is simply to restore Irish potatoes to a position of equality with livestock and all other agricultural commodities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I promised to yield very briefly to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wanted to ask some questions in order to be certain in my own mind on some points.

First, if I have correctly read the proposed legislation, the particular acreage provided for would be sufficient to give to every farmer the higher of 2 figures, or 40 percent of the highest acreage during any one of the years 1951, 1952, and 1953, provided the farmer did not exceed 50 percent of the cropland. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a rather difficult question to answer in a brief way. It is correct as to nearly every State. It is not correct as to the State of Texas and the State of Florida.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand Louisiana is short approximately five thousand acres plus.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would my statement be correct so far as Alabama is concerned?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would be correct so far as Alabama is concerned and if the figures supplied by the Cotton Production Division are correct. It is just barely correct as to Louisiana.

Mr. SPARKMAN. While I was in Alabama during the adjournment of Congress I inquired as to allotments made under the existing law, and I heard many complaints. One farmer came to my office and stated that he had a farm of 160 acres. There were 22 persons living on it. Three acres of the 160 acres were allotted to the home place, the house, barn, and outbuildings. Some 50 acres were in pastureland, and 100 acres in cropland, 90 acres of which were in cotton. Yet he had been assigned 22 acres. Is my understanding correct that he would be allotted 50 percent of the cropland, provided he did not exceed one of the other figures?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; he would be given the larger of 65 percent of the 3-year average or 40 percent of his largest planted acreage, but not more than 50 percent of his cropland. The 1954 Alabama allotment would be approximately a total of 1,346,401 acres.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That leads me to the next question. If I understand correctly, from examining the figures, it would make a minimum of 5 acres available to every cotton farmer. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it is left to the county committee as to the use to be made of the land.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But, as a matter of fact, under the old allotment, in my State every county except 12 received 5-acre allotments and those 12 counties could receive such allotments if they wanted to.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the State committee has power, in its discretion, to bring an exempt farmer up to his exemption. I understand that only 3,500 acres will be taken in the State of Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator mean 35,000 acres?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; 3,500.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I know it is not a large amount, because only a few counties have been left out.

Mr. EASTLAND. Alabama has 12 counties affected; Mississippi has 18 counties affected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. First, I wish to join with other Senators in expressing appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to others Senators for their expeditious reporting of the bill. During my visits to the cotton-growing sections of Tennessee during the past summer and fall, no problem was more pressing or about which there was more concern than the allotment of cotton acreage. It was realized by all cotton growers that in order to work out matters for their best interests with regard to planting, the whole question must be settled quickly. The bill will give them a better plan than would be the case if the bill did not pass.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, in connection with the 65–40–50 formula, set forth in the bill, if, according to his records, there would be sufficient to satisfy the farm demands of Tennessee on that basis.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the final allotment for Tennessee under the bill will be about 680,000 acres. The amount which Tennessee would need to satisfy the 60–40–50 provision would be 664,000 acres. So Tennessee would get roughly 30,000 acres more than would be needed for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a further question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield. However, I may first say that I have now been advised that the Tennessee figure is 671,901 acres, so there would be even more acreage than I at first stated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be about 10,000 acres more than the amount necessary to meet the formula?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Before the pending bill was reported, I introduced a bill, S. 2615, which I had intended offering as an amendment, had not the bill contained provisions, which set up 65 percent of the average acreage, and also provide a minimum of 45 percent, which, I believe, was contained in the law of 1950. Is it the understanding of the Senator from New Mexico that whether it is 45 percent or 50 percent, the State of Tennessee would not be materially affected?

Mr. ANDERSON. The bill would not materially affect the State of Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Many Tennessee farmers, as apparently is true of farmers in Arkansas and other States, have expressed a great deal of concern about the increased allocation to California and Arizona, not only with reference to this year, but also with reference to what might happen in the future. Is there any assurance, or can the Senator from New Mexico express any opinion, as to whether these increased allocations, under the present formula, will be carried out in the years to come, or whether there will be new requests for additional allotments to those States?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee, as I tried to say earlier, that by 1955, if quotas are provided for 1955, the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico will gain nothing by a 66-percent gadget. Because of their large plantings in previous years, no device of this special nature will be needed for either California or Arizona.

The cotton-producing history of California and Arizona for 1948, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, which will be the 5 years under consideration, will be sufficiently high so that those States will need no special 34-percent gadget to take care of them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, and the opinion of other members of the committee, that in the event there is to be a cotton quota in years to come, there will be necessity for some special gadget or quota for California, Arizona, and New Mexico?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am quite sure the Senator is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator feel that in the years to come Congress

will apply the principle to all the States, including the Southern States and Western States alike?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not want to try to commit Congress, but I think that is probably what the facts will reveal at that time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the Senator's own opinion, and we consider him to be a great authority on the problem of agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for his explanation of the bill. In the first part of his statement, I noticed he made a point that the bill is merely temporary legislation on the subject of cotton-acreage allocation. However, the Senator from New Mexico recognizes that there are certain parts of the old law with respect to administration that need some continuing legislation for 1954. Is not that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is not saying to the Senate, is he, that the bill covers all the problems, or even goes into all the problems, that need attention?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may, say to the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi that the bill does not touch many agricultural problems. The one he has mentioned ought to be acted upon only after notice has been given and open hearings have been held. That is why it is not touched in the proposed legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, the present position of the Senator from New Mexico is that that is an important matter, and perhaps he would have liked to go into it, but because of the time emergency with reference to planting he did not go into it and make a recommendation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Another point involved is the broader use of power by State and county committees in using the reserves available to them. Is not that another matter which needs some continuing legislation beyond 1954?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a matter which I do not feel may need legislation, but it needs consideration by the committee, and probably the committee will recommend legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate having the opinion of the Senator on these matters, because they are urgent and important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator from New Mexico leaves that question, and on the same point, does he mean that he does not believe the Senate should consider what might be termed permanent provisions in connection with the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Mississippi asked for my personal opinion. I do not think they should be considered now, because if we go into matters of that kind, we might find that we shall be here for many months.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think such provisions are included in the House bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Mississippi asked for my personal opinion, and I tried to give it to him. I am not trying to speak for the committee.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Agriculture has advised me that it will be between 2 and 3 weeks after the bill becomes law, if it becomes law, before the Department can really give final allocations for 1954. As I understand, in some areas cotton planting will be started in about 2 weeks from now. That is the reason why we did not take up some of the other matters we realized ought to be considered. I can assure the Senator from Arkansas that there will be an opportunity to take up matters which pertain to permanent law. It was after the Department told us they would require 2 or 3 weeks following the signing of the bill to place the law into operation that the committee decided to handle the matter on an emergency basis.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. With reference to the matters not covered in the bill, for example, the question of the Secretary of Agriculture being permitted to take into consideration the normal rate of abandonment and also underplanting, does not the Senator believe that they are matters which need the consideration of Congress, in connection with continuing legislation beyond 1954?

Mr. ANDERSON. Again I say to the Senator from Mississippi that I am fairly well satisfied with the pending bill, but I recognize that there are many persons who are not. I should be very happy to have the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry take up the other matters, but they could not possibly be handled in the pending bill.

Within 2 or 3 weeks farmers will begin planting cotton in Texas and Florida, and they are entitled to know as soon as possible what the allotments will be. It will take 2 or 3 weeks after the bill becomes law before the Secretary of Agriculture can advise the various States. So we thought it best to act promptly on this bill. As a matter of fact, not many persons thought we could get a bill to the Senate floor as quickly as this bill got here, and I commend the leadership for getting it here so quickly.

Mr. STENNIS. I desire to make it clear that even though we pass over these matters, it is recognized that they should be considered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I have not heard all the debate on the bill. Some of the things in which I am very much interested have been covered in the Senator's remarks and in his reply to the questions asked by other Senators. However, I was very much interested in the questions of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and in the replies to those questions, and also with respect to the questions of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], with respect to the contention that the bill is intended to be strictly a stopgap measure for 1954.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is entirely correct with reference to cotton.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am speaking with reference to cotton.

I understood further that the passage of the bill by the Senate in its present form would not preclude the conferees from considering some of the permanent provisions which are in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe I said that, but I agree that that is true. The passage of the bill by the Senate in its present form, if we strike out everything after the enacting clause in the bill as passed by the House, would not preclude the conferees from considering the House bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am trying to differentiate between the bill we are considering now and the bill the Senate may pass, for example, as a substitute for the House bill.

The bill does not take into account, is not intended to, and does not undertake to enact, permanent legislation or to incorporate provisions which would extend beyond 1954. The bill as it passed the House does incorporate some such provisions. There will be the opportunity in conference to consider provisions which some of us would like to have considered in conference and possibly have incorporated in the bill in its final form. That opportunity is present, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it is.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Or that opportunity will be present if the pending bill is passed as a substitute for the House measure?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that there has been a discussion of permanent changes. The bill provides only for temporary legislation.

It was also pointed out that if we did what it is proposed to do; namely, to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and insert the Senate bill as a substitute, these matters could be considered. Many Members of the Senate, including members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, would like to consider these matters. The conferees have the right to look these provisions over.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The bill provides that the county committee shall have three different methods of allocating to individual farmers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a very important provision of the bill. The provision permitting the county committee

to use three different methods of allocating to the individual farmers in the county is not in the bill as it passed the House, but is strictly a Senate provision. It is intended as a stopgap measure only for this year.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember whether that provision was in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wanted to make certain that the county committees had such authority, and that that was the intent of the provision. The county committee, in its discretion, can use the historic factor with regard to each farm for making the county quota allocation to that farm.

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not quite understand what the Senator said.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I interpret the provision, after the allocation of the increased acreage is made to the State, this bill increases the national acreage allotment from 17,910,448 acres to 21 million acres, and for individual allotments provides a formula of percentages of 65, 40, and 50. After these allotments have been taken care of, if there is acreage left over in a county for further allocation to individual farmers, then the county committee may, in its discretion, make allocations to individual farmers, based on previous farm history.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The county committee has the discretion to make the allocations in any of those ways.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then the county committee can make further distribution or allocation upon the basis of farm history, if it deems it wise to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Senator from Arkansas asked me the question, he did not speak of the percentages of 65, 40, and 50.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I did not.

Mr. ANDERSON. I fully agree with the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Mississippi. The way the Senator from Arkansas has stated it is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The provision in the bill is limited to 1954.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If there are to be any permanent features incorporated in the legislation at this session, assuming that no amendments are offered to correct some of the deficiencies we find in the measure, they will have to be taken from the bill as it passed the House or the conferees will have to work out in conference those provisions and the final language of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has already developed, more ably than I could have done, the points I had in mind. I should like to point out further that I believe it is fair to say that there is much sentiment among Senators for some of the permanent features which are contained in the bill as it passed the House. Those provisions will all be a proper subject for consideration by the conference committee, and it is the hope of the junior Senator from Tennessee that the committee will give consideration to them.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the Senator from Tennessee that they will be fairly considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield, or I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for the presentation he has made on the floor of the Senate of the pending bill. It was because of the emergency aspects of the measure, which the Senator has pointed out, that a general agreement was arrived at at the several meetings to which the Senator referred, and because of the position taken by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that a bill should be reported that could be handled in an emergency sort of way in order to meet the dates which will soon face us, that the majority leader, at the request of a number of Members of the Senate, especially members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, agreed to schedule this bill ahead of several highly controversial measures which will be facing decision by the Senate in the immediate future. Otherwise, had it not been given the right of way, it might have gotten behind several weeks of debate on other measures, which would have adversely affected the objective the committee was trying to accomplish.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the majority leader that those interested in the bill appreciate very much the scheduling of the bill at this time, because if it had gotten behind several weeks of debate, no good whatever would have been done by the bill, because then action upon it would have been too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 17, after the word "section" and the period, it is proposed to insert:

Before apportioning such unallocated acreage to counties as provided in the foregoing sentence, the State committee may, if it determines that such action is required to provide equitable allotments within the State, apportion such unallocated acreage directly to farms to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in subsection (f) (1) of this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator from Mississippi rise to explain the amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; or if the Senate is ready to vote, that is all right, and I shall not explain the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to have a little explanation of the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this amendment means that after acreage is allocated from the State's increased allotment under the 65–40–50 provision, then the State committee is authorized to allocate acreage to the 5-acre man or to the man who grows less than 5 acres and who is exempt from acreage reduction, in order to bring up his allotment to his exemption, which the law requires.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me, let me say that I do not quite understand this amendment. I thought the 5-acre man was already taken care of.

Mr. EASTLAND. There are a great many counties in the country where the county allotment was not sufficient to give the 5-acre man the 5 acres to which he was entitled.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This amendment is intended to insure, then, that each man has at least 5 acres; is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; if the farmer has grown 3 acres, he will get 3 acres. If he has grown 4 acres, he will get 4 acres. If he has grown 5 acres, he will get 5 acres. That is the maximum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, the purpose of the amendment is to insure that if in the past the farmer has grown 5 acres, that much acreage will be assured to him as the minimum. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The amendment provides that minimum in the State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the State or in the county?

Mr. EASTLAND. In the State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, this has to be done at the State level. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, because under the provisions of this bill many counties would not get sufficient acreage to be able to build up the 5-acre farmers to that amount.

This amendment was presented to the committee by my colleague the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and myself.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In the first place, this amendment would not change the allocation of acreage in the bill, as between the States, would it?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, sir.

Mr. KERR. In the second place, as I understand the amendment, it does not apply to a State with reference to which the allocation in the bill is inadequate to give the 65 percent of the 3-year average to all the farmers in the State. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

This amendment does not add an acre to this bill. The amendment purely has to do with the distribution of each State's quota, after each State secures its quota.

Mr. KERR. The amendment has to do with distribution within a State if there is any surplus acreage left after every farmer has received 65 percent of the 3-year average. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. This amendment means that in most of the States the farmer who has had 5 acres will get his 5 acres, does it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. As a practical proposition, yes; the amendment will mean that, except as to Florida and Texas, which require approximately 80,000 acres.

Mr. HILL. But in all the other States, as a practical operation this amendment means that the farmer who has had 5 acres will get his 5 acres this year, does it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. It means that the farmer in practically every State will get the exemption to which the law says he is entitled.

Mr. HILL. Yes; in practically every State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think this bill is a distinct improvement over the orders issued by the Secretary of Agriculture and the allotment of 17,900,000 acres to all the cotton-producing States of the Nation. However, it appears to me that the bill contains features which are discriminatory and unjustified.

I believe the provision which provides for 315,000 additional acres, and then gives half of that acreage to 3 States arbitrarily, and not on the basis of permanent legislation which has been in effect for years, is unjustified and constitutes special privilege by legislation, in favor of the beneficiary States, and against the great majority of the cotton-producing States.

I have been greatly impressed by what has been said here about the emergency features of the bill. I have been somewhat intimidated by the chairman of the committee; who has dared Senators to move to recommit the bill if it does not suit them—in effect saying to them that they will either take this bill or the Benson order of 17,900,000 acres.

Mr. President, I respect the committee——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I did not quite understand the Senator from Oklahoma when he referred to "the Benson order." He means, does he not, that the public law requires the cotton acreage to be that much, unless Congress enacts the measure now before the Senate?

Mr. KERR. I understood there was a man by the name of Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, and that he had issued an order about the cotton acreage allotments for 1954.

Mr. THYE. In order that we may be certain we are not accusing one man, let me say there is a public law which this Congress or a previous Congress enacted, and the Secretary of Agriculture must follow that provision of law. Therefore, in the event this Congress does nothing about the pending measure, the Secretary of Agriculture must revert to that public law; and therefore there would be only 17,900,000-plus acres of cotton to allocate to the States in accordance with the historic base that each State and each county had.

As a member of the subcommittee, I, along with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], studied the question covered by the pending legislative proposal. We studied it as carefully as any three men could. We were serving as a subcommittee of the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This measure was the very best we could possibly recommend to the full committee and to the Senate.

The only reason why special acreage allotments were provided for or taken into consideration for Arizona and California was simply that there is a growing population in the Nation. No one can deny that. California and Arizona had some land come into production, through irrigation; and some came into production because of a military request or a national-defense measure.

When the drastic cut-back occurred because of a previous public law, the subcommittee, acting for the full Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, arrived at the only possible sound recommendation, as embodied in the provision for Arizona and California. So that the subcommittee would be correct in its consideration, the question was submitted to a farm organization representing the cotton-producing States of the South, in order that they might assist in advising us. This particular farm group gave consideration and, according to their best judgment, made to us a recommendation which we embodied along with the best judgment that those of us serving on the subcommittee had; and we submitted it to the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the full committee finally acted. That is the question before us.

With all due respect to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma, I ask him not to refer to the law as one individual's law, because the National Legislature enacted the law to provide 17,900,000 plus acres as a cotton base. That is what we shall have if we do not pass some other measure.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator name the particular farm organization which made the recommendation? If he did, I did not understand it.

Mr. THYE. I shall be very happy to name it. It was the National Farm Bureau Federation, which happened to consider the subject at one of its national conferences. I had met those gentlemen before, not only in connection with discussions of the cotton question, but in the discussion of other agricultural questions. I have found them to be a pretty reliable body on which to lean.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his confessions and observations. But, Mr. President, I do not recognize the Farm Bureau Federation as the agricultural authority for prescribing farm programs for the State of Oklahoma. I recognize them as a great organization. Their president probably is the most powerful contribution that the Republican Party has made to this administration. However, I do not happen to agree with him on many vital issues affecting the people of Oklahoma. Nor do I permit him to speak for me on this floor. Nor am I bound by what he says when he speaks. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to be so bound, that is his privilege; but I disown it either as a privilege or obligation of the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. The question I wish to ask the Senator is this: Was not the Senator mistaken when he referred to a cotton-acreage allotment as one individual's proposal? Was he not mistaken when he referred to it as an order of Mr. Benson rather than as a public law on the statute books?

Mr. KERR. In that regard I will say that I do not agree with the Secretary of Agriculture in the interpretation which he accepted, either from the Farm Bureau Federation or from his Solicitor, as to the amount of acreage that should be allotted for the year 1954, under the law then in effect. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to accept without question the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to the meaning of law, that is his privilege; but it is neither my prerogative nor my duty. I disown it and disclaim it and refuse to be bound by it. I say that it was a Benson order. I say that there are serious differences of opinion as to whether or not the allotment could have been anything else. I, for one, am of the belief that it did not have to be that figure. Its issuance by Benson makes it neither legal, sacred, nor above criticism or dispute, so far as I am concerned. Does that answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Oklahoma will still have to admit that it is a public law.

Mr. KERR. No. The Senator from Oklahoma proclaims that it was an order issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. THYE. Under a public law.

Mr. KERR. Based upon what he said his concept of a public law was, yes; with which concept I do not agree.

I do not acknowledge that the Secretary of Agriculture can speak for the Senator from Oklahoma; and I wish to say to my good friend from Minnesota that he is free from any such bonds or shackles, except as he chooses to accept them.

I repeat that I prefer the provisions of this bill, as reported by the committee, to the Benson order. But I still agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that the bill contains provisions which constitute legislative special privileges for certain States and certain industries.

The provision with reference to authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to spend $100 million to support the price of Irish potatoes is no part of the emergency cotton acreage situation which confronts the Congress. I wish to say to my good friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for whom I have as much respect and affection as for any other Member of the Senate, that I could not be in more complete disagreement with

any man than I am with him when he says that the Secretary of Agriculture has spent money for the benefit of the meat producers, in spending $100 million to buy canned meat, hamburger, and canned gravy from the packers. That operation has left the producers where it found them—broke—and it has resulted, in 1953, in the packers having an increase of 50 percent in their net profits over the preceding year. It was an act by the Secretary of Agriculture which penalized the consumers. It raised the price of processed meat on every meat counter in America. He did not compete with the packer for the live animal, for the benefit of the producer. He competed with the millions of consumers of the country for the product, to the benefit of the packers. Their financial reports for last year reflect greatly increased profits, brought about directly by reason of the bonus with which the Secretary of Agriculture provided them, under the guise of an act on his part for the benefit of the meat producers.

Let me say to the sponsors of the potato amendment that if the Secretary of Agriculture uses section 32 money for the benefit of potato producers on the same basis that it is claimed he used it for the benefit of cattle producers, he will spend the money buying potato chips, French-fried potatoes, industrial alcohol, and vodka, which are the products of the processors of Irish potatoes, and which, I assure Senators, will lend small comfort to the producers of the potatoes.

Mr. President, this is an emergency measure. I resent the fact that the chairman of the committee has said to the Senate, "Take it or recommit it." That is intimidation and coercion which is unjustified and unwarranted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator permit the Senator from Vermont to accept the compliment just paid him by the Senator from Oklahoma? The Senator from Vermont is very happy to learn that he can intimidate the Senator from Oklahoma, but he is sure that he has not rendered the Senator from Oklahoma speechless.

Mr. KERR. I will say that if the Senator from Vermont is ever rendered speechless, it will be a phenomenon which I have never contemplated, and the evidences of which I have yet to see. I compliment his power, yes; but neither his using it nor his parading it. Perhaps the emergency is sufficient to justify bowing to coercion and intimidation, but I hope the day will never come when those who represent the rank and file of the cotton producers will be in the position of intimidating or coercing anyone in order to obtain simple justice on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I call up an amendment, on page 2, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike the word "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one-fourth."

On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike the word "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three-fourths."

Mr. KERR. The effect of the amendment would be to reallocate the 315,000 bonus acreage which is provided for in the bill, and would distribute it one-fourth to the 3 Western States and three-fourths to the historic cotton-producing States. I believe, in the interest of equity and justice, and in order to eliminate to some extent the discriminatory features of the language of the bill as written, the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment would be to take away from the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and California an allotment of cotton acreage which is absolutely essential if distress among numerous cotton growers in those States is to be avoided.

So far as the large cotton operators in my State are concerned—and I believe the statement applies to California—namely, those who are able to stand a reduction, it would be much better for them in the long run to allow nature to take its course, so to speak; that is, to allow the cotton to be produced in those areas of the United States where a pound of it can be produced at less cost than elsewhere. That is the reason why there has been an increase in the cotton acreage in New Mexico, Arizona, and California. In those States cotton can be produced at less cost—in fact, at about half the cost—because they can produce more pounds per acre.

If there were no action taken at all, and the allotment remained at 17,900,000 acres, we would have to endure it only for 1 year, certainly for not more than 2 years, and even in the second year we would get credit for the acreage history which we would have made in 1953, and that history would help us along.

There are those in the Western areas—and I am speaking now about the large growers—who, because of their financial ability, would be pleased to see the allotment remain as it is. But that would be exceedingly hard on a large number of people who have grown cotton only for a short time, for they would be reduced to practically no acreage at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Arizona understand that the acreage referred to is hardship acreage?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Where is the hardship?

Mr. HAYDEN. The hardship is in the States to which the additional acreage has been assigned by the committee bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAYDEN. Hardship is the sole reason for the assignment of the acreage. The impression seems to have spread that some very wealthy cotton producers have gone into the cotton-growing business in Arizona and California and that they are the ones who would be benefited by the provision referred to and which the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to strike out. The provision was not put into the bill for that purpose at all. It was for the purpose of assisting the smaller growers, namely, those who have been planting cotton for only a year or two. In two counties in Arizona, Yuma, and Cochise County, cotton has been planted only recently to any great extent. They would have practically no opportunity to plant anything at all. They would have to go out of the business.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that because they have been planting cotton for only the past 3 years or so?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And because each year they have doubled or tripled the planting of the year before?

Mr. HAYDEN. They have planted more acres to cotton. The result is that they are building up a cotton history, which they do not have now.

Such a history would be immensely valuable to them. If we did nothing but stand by what the Secretary of Agriculture has done, those who could afford it would be better off, because they would have the benefit of the history which has been built up in the past 2 or 3 years, but which does not do them any good now.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On the face of it, it looks like discrimination to place a special provision in the bill to take care of growers who just recently started to plant and grow cotton, whereas the historic cotton-producing States, which have grown cotton all the time, must make a concession in order to aid those States which just recently entered the production of cotton. On the face of it, it appears to be unfair to ask the older States to make these tremendous sacrifices. I do not charge that to be a fact, but I say, on the face of it, it looks as though we are giving some special consideration to States which have just started the growing of cotton.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me point out, first, that the total increase in the bill is divided between the old cotton-growing States and the new cotton-growing States, and that it is a provision by which distress may be relieved.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to make two points: First, with respect to the new cotton growers, the history is based upon a 5-year period. The law refers to the 5 years preceding the year in which the proclamation of quotas is made. That means that on 1954 quotas, announced in 1953, the years 1952, 1951, 1950, 1949, and 1948. The Secretary of Agriculture has ruled that since 1949 cannot be counted, the year 1947 is to be used instead. The cotton growers in California wanted to take the Secretary into court. I believe they could take him into court successfully, because the law calls for the last 5 years. However, a 6-year period is taken, with the year 1949 being

dropped out because it was not to be counted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is being done without any authority of law. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. The Secretary has made a very careful study of it, but I know what we intended to do, because I wrote that part of the bill.

The second point I wish to make is that cotton-producing States get credit for other crops planted. In many States during the war the farmers would stop growing cotton for a few years and get credit for the production of other crops. We always carried the credits ahead, and some States received dual credit, one credit for wheat, for example, and another for cotton, grown on the same land, or they would get credit for cotton and proceed to plant soybeans.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe the Senator meant that it was done in my State.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure it was not done in the State of Arkansas.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator from New Mexico confirm what I say, namely, that if it comes to choosing between the provisions of the bill and standing on the law as it reads today we in New Mexico, Arizona, and California would be in a far better position eventually if we abided by the present law.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no question about it in my mind.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because we would gain immediately under the historic basis, inasmuch as if we stopped production for 1 year we would get credit for the acreage. In other words, it is inevitable that the growing of cotton will move west where it can be grown at less cost a pound.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I have been in a cotton meeting in his State and sat right beside him while the cotton farmers were saying they would prefer to have the 17-million-acre allotment stand for the next year, but I think that would work great hardship across the country, and it would work great hardship in the Senator's State. There were persons in the meeting who could stand it, but the small cotton farmer of Arizona could not stand it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was about to ask the Senator whether he considered the provision to give half of the approximately 300,000 acres special increase provided in the bill to the three States mentioned would be an advantage to those States over the original allotment of 17,900,000 acres?

Mr. HAYDEN. They would have to be balanced in order really to determine what would be best.

What I was trying to say was that in Arizona, California, and New Mexico we can grow cotton at less cost than elsewhere in the United States. We can produce more pounds per acre at less cost per pound. The grade of cotton we grow by careful selection of seed is the kind of cotton the manufacturer desires to buy. Proportionately, in that there are not so many pounds going into the loan as in the South.

Those are facts which cannot be overlooked. It is clearly indicated that the movement is to the West. While it may be a disadvantage to the South this year and next year, if the law operates as it must, and we go along in the regular way, we will continue to grow more cotton in the western area, and as we build up our acreage——

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator means, does he not, that if there were no controls the farmers would continue to build up a cotton-producing history.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. Or, if we had controls, we would still gain the advantage of additional history made prior to the controls. We have devoted much of the land to cotton in the past 2 or 3 years, and do not have a 5-year history.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought I understood the Senator to say that without this special increase and special allocation assigned to the 3 States mentioned, his State would really be better off with an allocation of 17,900,000 acres instead of one of 21,000,000 acres.

Mr. HAYDEN. The increased amount provided for in the bill is divided between the old cotton-growing States and the new cotton-growing States. The old cotton-growing States get as many additional acres as do the new ones. We need to take care of the small grower, not the large producer who could worry along very well on the basis of 17,900,000 acres.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I do not understand is why the 3 States need to take care of the small growers when an overall increase of 3,000,000 acres is provided above the 17,900,000 acres under existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because we do not have the background of a cotton-growing history. We would not have more than 10 or 15 percent of the acreage, because cotton planting in the western area is so recent. The provision is designed to meet hardship cases.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understood from the junior Senator from New Mexico awhile ago, in discussing the provisions of the bill, that this is a stop-gap bill, a measure to meet the emergency situation of this year, because of the planting season being right at hand, so that if any legislation is to be enacted it must be enacted quickly in order to make it effective for this year; but after this year, in the general legislation which is to follow, the overall farm program legislation, such special features, such as this provision in the bill, will not be required.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; because, in the meantime, we shall have built up our history of cotton growing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is to enable the farmers this year to build up their history so that next year in permanent legislation they can be on an even basis with the traditional cotton-growing States without asking any special provision for increased acreage.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator has stated it well.

There is one other matter I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate, with reference to Anderson, Clayton & Co. They are represented in Arizona by a subsidiary which buys and gins cotton. The only amortization I know of was in connection with a company called the Federal Warehouse & Compress Co., whose headquarters, I think, are in Memphis. It is made up of people from Arkansas and Tennessee who moved to Arizona and erected some oil mills. My recollection is they received tax amortization on three of those mills. But that does not apply to Anderson, Clayton & Co. The mills were badly needed in order to take care of the situation.

The same thing is true of compresses. We needed them very badly. The normal market for the cotton produced in that area before the war was Japan. We hope that in due time the bales can be compressed for shipment overseas.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate not to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has had charge of the bill, has stated that the necessity for the expeditious enactment of the bill as proposed prevented the consideration of some provisions which certainly some farmers and those who represent some of the farmers feel should be in independent legislation.

I think we all realize the necessity for expeditious action on this bill. Some provisions which we may call long-term provisions have already been adverted to, but I desire to emphasize what I feel to be the need for those provisions in independent legislation by referring to 2 or 3 of them.

Specifically, I should like to call attention to the fact that the authority for the use of reserve acreage, both at the county and State levels, should be broadened. This would provide State and county committees with the machinery to meet more adequately problems commonly referred to as "hardship cases." Local farmer-elected committeemen are more nearly in a position to judge the extent of hardships and should have the latitude to meet local conditions at the local level.

Secondly, while the percentage of cropland factor method of distributing acreage by the county to the farm, as is now provided in the law, fits some parts of the Cotton Belt, a farm history method of distribution would more nearly fill the requirements of other sections.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I was particularly interested in. So, I inquired of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] regarding the provisions of the bill on page 3, lines 14 to 19, inclusive, which were amended a while ago by the committee amendment offered by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] which does give the county committee discretion to use 1 of 3 methods.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. I was going to invite attention to that fact. The bill does give the county committees a discretionary power to make the selection.

As I understand, this provision, which is considered highly desirable, applies only to 1954. As I said in the first instance, I wish to call attention to what I would call long-term provisions, which I think ought to be included in any cotton legislation, not merely for 1954, but also for succeeding years. That is what I am calling attention to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was particularly interested in having the emergency legislation give such authority and discretion to the county committees, because I feel that they know best what will fit the local situations, and can more equitably provide for the extra allotment or distribution. In my opinion, although there may be some exceptions, generally the historical basis is the better way to handle the matter.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his contribution. The Senator from Arkansas and I find ourselves in full accord. What I was seeking to do was to emphasize that this provision ought to be carried not only for 1954, but should be written into the law for succeeding years.

Thirdly, the Secretary of Agriculture should have the authority to take into consideration normal underplantings and abandoned acres in setting the level of allotment for any particular year.

The 5-year rate of abandonment is 2½ percent of the total acreage planted to cotton. In 1953, the rate of abandonment was estimated by the USDA at 3.7 percent.

In 1950, the last year of acreage controls, underplantings amounted to more than 10 percent of the total allotment. The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture has ruled that the Secretary does not have the authority to take these important facts into consideration in making his calculations.

The Secretary should be permitted to use all of the information available to him in arriving at an allotment figure.

Finally, S. 2643 provides that the additional acreage allotted to States will first be used by State committees to provide that all farms will receive an allotment equal to the larger of 65 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953, or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted on the farm in any one of these 3 years, provided that this acreage does not exceed 50 percent of the tilled land on the farm. This 50 percent cropland limitation more nearly fits the farming system in irrigated areas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that the committee of conference might properly consider these suggestions?

Mr. HILL. The only reason I am now addressing the Senate is that I very much hope the committee of conference will give these matters their earnest consideration, and do some of the very things I am certain the Senator from Arkansas and I very much wish to see done. I agree with the position of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope that when the bill goes to conference, the conferees will go thoroughly into the matters and consider them carefully. I hope that as many of these provisions as possible will be written into the bill by the committee of conference.

Incidentally, the conference committee will have very wide latitude because, as the Senator knows, there are 2 different bills, 1 passed by the House, and the bill now before the Senate. So, under the rules, the conference will have very wide latitude.

Mr. HILL. Furthermore, this feature would benefit most the farmers who have helped to build the surplus by failure to practice diversification and continuing to plant a high percentage of their cropland in cotton. This extra benefit to the high-planting farm would be at the expense of the family farmer, who has sought diligently to diversify his farming. A 40-percent cropland limitation on hardship cotton acres would prevent inequities on farms that have continued high cotton plantings and, at the same time, would assure a wider and fairer distribution of the State's additional cotton allotment, thereby benefiting a greater number of farms. This is the same cropland limitation that was in effect in 1950, and I can see no reason why it would not work equally well in 1954.

In conclusion, I wish to point out that both the Senate and the House Committees on Agriculture spent many days, during the summer of 1953, in hearing and considering the problems of cotton acreage and apportionment. If we fail to act now upon these questions of technical administration, we are merely postponing, for a few weeks or months, problems that will again have to be considered at a time when the Members of Congress will be much more deeply involved in other pressing legislation.

The farmer's welfare and the welfare of the whole Nation, so dependent upon the economic well-being of the farmer, demands that we act now.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I heartily favor the 40-percent limitation. I hope something along that line can be worked out in conference. The committee agreed to it, but the solicitor for the Department of Agriculture could not devise a gadget that would work. He is now working on one. If he can develop it, I think it will be adopted.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I am very much gratified to know that he feels as I do about this provision. I may say that I am also very much gratified to know that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will be on the committee of conference. I know that the Senate can repose great faith in him as a member of the conference, feeling as he does with particular reference to this provision. As the distinguished Senator from Arkansas suggests very frankly and very forthrightly, we are relying on the Senator from Mississippi.

I strongly feel that the provision to which I have adverted should be included in cotton legislation, not simply for this year, but also for succeeding years. I hope the committee of conference, representing the Senate and the House, will have the same desire to see this provision included in the bill and will report to Congress proposed legislation containing such a provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I was about to yield the floor, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope that the proposed legislation which has been presented to the Senate as meeting an emergency situation, which I believe was generally recognized as an emergency, will not be so altered by the conference committee as to change the equity of the bill or the spirit in which it has been presented to the Senate. It is expected that permanent legislation will be reported later, but I should not want the statement to stand in the RECORD that there was a general invitation so to change the bill that it would come back to the Senate not looking like the type of equitable legislation pending before the Senate today.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I think this provision would not change the equity, the justice, or, I may even say, in many ways the emergency nature of the bill. I think these provisions would greatly enhance and confirm the equity and justice of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. As I understand the Senator from Alabama, he desires to have in the bill a workable, legal provision to the effect that if the West wants 50 percent, it can have it; and if the South wants 50 percent, it can have it.

Mr. HILL. If the South wants 40 percent, it can have it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; the South may have it. It must be worked out in a legal manner.

Mr. HILL. I think that it can be worked out in such a manner that it will in no way change the fundamental character of what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has referred to as the equity or justice of the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would seem to me that if we could divide the 315,000 acres in such a way that it meant about 13 and a fraction percent to the 3 Western States and about 1 percent to the other States, it ought to be possible to split the cropland allotment in some way that would do justice to the southeastern historic cotton-growing area, at least.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Georgia has so well suggested, I think there is no danger of injustice in the proposal.

On the other hand, I think the proposal is shot through with justice.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama gave me the privilege of reading portions of his statement before he delivered it in the Senate, so I am familiar with it, although I was not in the Chamber at the time he delivered it. The Senator from Alabama was referring to matters of administration and changes that are needed in the law regardless of what the acreage allotments may be. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is pleading for permanent, continuing legislation in connection with the administration of the law. It will be needed as much in future years as it is for the year 1954.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is exactly correct. One of the provisions is that the election shall be left with the county committee as to which method shall be used. That is written into the 1954 allotment. I say that is good. We ought to have it for 1954, and we ought to have it for succeeding years.

Mr. STENNIS. On that point, no one needs to be disturbed about the equity of the proposal.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder if the Senator would enlighten me a little about the question of the difficulty of adjustment with the Western States. On page 174 of the hearings before the Senate committee I find that in Alabama there will be about 6½ acres per voter, and in California 35.1 acres. Why is it so much more difficult for a man who has a large farm to take a cut than it is for the man with a small farm, and why is that an argument for the added allocation to California?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on the one hand, I do not believe such an argument is a good one, and on the other hand, I think what we ought to do is to encourage, as much as possible, what we call the family farm, a farm on which a man and his family live. He and his family not only vote there, but they run and operate the farm. That is the type of farm of which there are so many in Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending bill with a great deal of reluctance.

It is a measure which will create some injustices. It will not, in every instance, distribute the cotton acreage according to strict standards of fairness.

Were there time, I would offer some amendments. They would seek to meet the peculiar conditions under which cotton is planted in Texas—conditions which are not duplicated on the same scale in any other State.

Unfortunately, there is not time. Amendments at this point would involve time-consuming debate and study. They would result in delay, and our cotton farmers, particularly the cotton farmers of Texas, cannot afford delay.

Texas every year plants the first and almost if not the last acre of cotton planted in the United States. The planting starts in south Texas and moves gradually north.

A few of our farmers in South Texas and the lower Rio Grande Valley will start planting before the end of the month. Large-scale planting will start early in February.

Our south Texas farmers cannot plan their operations with any confidence in the future unless Congress acts speedily. Without a law, they will not know how much to plant.

I do not feel that their future should be jeopardized by a prolonged debate over a highly complicated issue. There are more than 3,400,000 acres of cotton land involved in this bill—some 1,300,000 additional acres for Texas. The farmers of America are entitled to know as soon as possible what they can count upon as their share.

There is one other point I should like to make. Between the Senate and the House bills, there is sufficient leeway to permit an adjustment that will go far toward solving the situation. This adjustment can be reached in the conference committee, and I am assured by some of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee who will be on the conference that remedial language will be carefully considered when the conferees discuss both the House and Senate bills.

I am foregoing lengthy discussion now on the unusual problems of Texas—problems complicated by geographical distribution and different types of farming.

I shall be ready to assist the conferees in any possible manner. It is a difficult and complex issue and I hope it can be solved in a spirit of reason. I also hope there will come back to the Senate in a conference report a bill which will assist us in our State to make allotments directly to the counties on the same basis on which the national allotments are made to the State.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has been stressed here again and again that the pending measure is emergency legislation, and is applicable only in the year 1954, and on that basis, and on that basis alone, I have been able to bring myself to support the bill.

I can see no justification for the great increases that have been given to the irrigated areas. In the division of the extra 315,000 acres we find that 157,000 acres is given to 3 States which are comparative newcomers in cotton production, compared with the 157,000 which is allocated to the 11 or 12 other States which have been engaged in the production of cotton for many decades. More than that, another gadget has been inserted in the bill which has the effect of giving 59,000 acres to the States of Arizona and California.

It may well be that in the economic shifts which have occurred in the life of this land there has been a shift in the production of cotton from the historic areas where it was produced for so long, areas which produced cotton and exported it to the markets of the world in sufficient quantity to maintain a favorable balance of trade for our country for more than 80 years by the sale of that commodity alone. It may be that cotton can be produced in the irrigated States of the West cheaper than in the South, and that the old cotton States will be forced out of the cotton business. If that is to happen by economic forces, there is nothing that can stop it. But, I certainly do regret that it is found necessary to accelerate that program on the basis of gifts such as will be awarded under the proposed law.

My support of the pending bill on the 1-year basis certainly cannot be taken as a precedent for the future when cotton legislation is before this body for consideration.

There are some provisions in the bill that will prevent a great many hardships. The additional acreage involved is necessary because of a very patent failure in the basic law which provides for the distribution of cotton on the basis of historical production as between the States, which instructs the States to allocate it as between the counties in the States on the basis of historical production, and then in the counties themselves, where the base has been established it is distributed on the basis of cropland.

That has brought about a great dislocation on many farms. They were prepared to produce cotton. They had the labor available. Anyone who is familiar with agricultural life in America knows that it takes more downright backbreaking hand labor to produce cotton than it does to produce any other commodity with the possible exception of tobacco.

The bill does eliminate that inequity by giving the increased acreage on the 65, 40, and 50 percent basis.

In passing I wish to say to the Senators who have spent so much time on the bill and who will serve as conferees that I hope that some arrangement can be worked out that will retain the 40 percent basis, at least for the Southeastern States.

Another great advantage of the bill is that it helps to cure the basic weakness in the original law, which distributes the cotton acreage on the basis of cropland rather than on the historic basis. It is very helpful to have in the proposed bill a provision which permits any farmer to turn in to the county committee for redistribution any acreage allotment which he will not use. That will go a long way in remedying some of the more acute conditions and preventing a dislocation of many farmers.

If some relief is not afforded such as is provided in this bill, hundreds of the poorest people in this land, those who have the lowest income in the Nation, tenant farmers and sharecroppers, will practically be put "in the road," because there will be no work for them on many farms where the original allotments are so small.

I share the hope that the conferees will devise ways and means of providing permanent legislation that will establish a fairer and more equitable basis for the distribution of our basic national allotments when it comes to the distribution within the county to the individual farms. It should be done on a historic

cotton-acreage basis rather than on cropland.

Mr. President, I hope that the bill will eliminate the many very great hardships that would have been prevalent under the failures and weaknesses of the basic law. It is a 1-year bill. I hope that the conference committee will devise a fairer measure than either the House or Senate bill. If one is proposed which is a fairer one than either the temporary legislation or the permanent legislation proposed in the House bill, I shall give it my support.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator recognizes the fact that we are confronted with an emergency situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator knows, if time were not of the very essence, the measure undoubtedly would be on the floor of the Senate for 2 or 3 weeks, during which time we would thresh out once and for all some of these very important questions regarding the allotment of cotton acreage. I regret that time does not permit the writing of a more equitable bill. However, we know that a delay in the Senate means no law at all can be enacted.

I desire to congratulate my friends from the wheat-producing areas for having been able, last year, to get through legislation relating to wheat allotments, and not be confronted with the condition in which those of us who came from areas that are primarily devoted to the production of cotton find ourselves today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say that the Senator from Georgia has very ably expressed my sentiments regarding this bill. We are here confronted with such a situation that obviously we cannot take time to try to solve these problems and at the same time meet the urgency that is upon us.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are confronted with a very grave condition, and we are operating with a very tight time limitation. For that reason alone I can justify my support of the pending bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished and able junior Senator from Georgia has voiced the thought in my mind more ably than I could have done, with respect to the shift, by means of legislation, in the production of a basic commodity from a historic area of production to a new area of production.

Will not the Senator from Georgia, with his great ability, also indicate to the Senate his agreement with me, if he entertains it, that in an area where the production is the product of many hands, many small homesteads, such a shift of production will occasion far greater human hardship than will be relieved by granting additional acreage to certain production areas where the land is owned in large tracts and is irrigated, thereby bringing in great production?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Tennessee well knows that particularly in the hill areas of his State and my State and all the other historic cotton-producing States, the average cotton farm is very small, sometimes having only 3, 4, or 5 acres. Cotton produced there is tediously dug out of the ground—and the hill country is more often than not rocky ground—with hoes and pony plows. This cotton is picked by the fingers of women and children and placed into bags swung from their shoulders. It is carried long distances on weary backs before the cotton is weighed and sent to the gin.

This tremendous shift in cotton to the high producing irrigated areas is a great blow to thousands of small family-sized farms. The large number of cotton farms in any one of the historic cotton producing States as compared with the small number of cotton farms in the States that have only lately come into the field of cotton production with irrigated lands will demonstrate that when we speak in terms of human beings, human welfare, and human values, we are adversely affecting the lives of thousands of poor people by reducing the only cash income they have when we take cotton away from the historic cotton producing States. In the new irrigated areas farming is mechanized, and in most instances these large farms are owned and operated by corporations.

These shifts in production depress the already low standards of living of the very poorest people of the Nation. Any table of statistics relating to national income which can possibly be produced will show that the lowest annual income goes to the small cotton farmers of the historic Cotton Belt.

These people who are already our poorest will be further disadvantaged by shifts in production to the corporate farms in irrigated areas. To deny them the opportunity to produce a few pounds of cotton, which is their only source of cash income, is a serious matter. They are so poor it gets down to a question of being able to provide shoes for their children. Reductions in their income involves real hardship and privation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on amendment B, I hope the Members of the Senate will realize that the amendment only reduces the acreage for the State of New Mexico. The amendment is supposed to reduce by one-half the hardship acreage for the States of Arizona and California; but those States get back that same acreage under the 34 percent gadget.

I am trying to say that neither Arizona nor California would lose one acre of production, under the provisions of the amendment. The only State adversely affected by the amendment would be the State of New Mexico, which would lose 11,000 acres.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator say that this bill is written in such a way that if an amendment would change the discrimination visited in one paragraph upon these States, they would regain that acreage by other provisions in other paragraphs of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I only point out that the amendment as now written would cut 11,000 acres from the allotment for the State of New Mexico. The amendment would not touch the acreage in Arizona; it would not touch the acreage in California. It would add approximately 50,000 acres to be divided among all other States.

I point out to certain Senators that I have tried to be fair with reference to this legislative proposal.

I know the Senator from Mississippi tried very hard to have a provision written into the bill concerning total cropland, and he found that I tried my very best to find a legal basis upon which it could be put into the bill. The same statement applies to many other recommendations which came before the committee.

I think it is a little severe to cut 11,000 acres from the allocation for New Mexico, which did not have to have another gadget in order to keep its acreage in line.

If the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to have the acreage given to the States, of Arizona and California reduced, he has to do it by amending the 66 percent gadget.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, with great reluctance I withdraw the amendment. I say to the Senator from New Mexico that it was not intended to take 11,000 acres from New Mexico and give it to the historic cotton-producing States; but it was intended to take half of 157,500 acres from California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and reallocate it to the historic States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know that was the Senator's intention; but because of the 66 percent limitation, I know the amendment would not affect California or Arizona. It would affect only New Mexico.

Mr. KERR. What the Senator from New Mexico has said indicates that in this bill there are gadgets and devices of discrimination beyond those which I thought I had discovered in the limited time available to me to study the bill.

On that basis and on the basis of the withdrawal of this amendment, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD amendment A, the purpose of which would have been to increase the 21 million-acre allocation to a 21,500,000-acre allocation. I shall not urge the amendment at this time. I now ask that amendment A be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. KERR to the bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, viz: On page 1, line 9, strike the word "twenty-one" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one million five hundred thousand."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I join other Senators who have here expressed the wish that the discriminations in this bill, reinforced and safeguarded by gadets and language in various provisions of the bill, will be found by the conferees, and that in the conference committee a meeting ground will be found between the provisions of this bill and those of

the House bill, that will, in the spirit of real equity and justice, accomplish and be consistent with the principle expressed by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], but by finding a different objective than the one he outlined.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself also, along with the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I was not present to hear previous debate. No doubt there are other Senators with whom I, representing in part the cotton growers of the State of Missouri, would also like to associate myself.

Mr. President, I have a short statement to make with respect to the problem of the cotton growers of Missouri.

Responsible cotton-producer representatives from Missouri and other States have informed me they cannot support the bill in its present form.

They state this bill tends to promote sectionalism; also that thousands of farm families in the old-established cotton-growing areas, such as Missouri, will be penalized at the same time that special acreage is given to Western States. That would seem most unfortunate.

Missouri has a relatively small cotton-growing area—seven counties to be exact; but there are more cotton farms in Missouri than the combined total of cotton farms in 3 large cotton-producing States of the West to which first 157,500 acres, and then 59,000 more, are given.

These 3 States already have an allotment of 1,153,262 acres for 1954. Missouri has an allotment of 391,396 acres.

In other words, Missouri farmers have approximately one-third the allotment per farm as have these western farmers. These same Western States have 108,465 more acres than they had under allotments in 1950.

Missouri, on the other hand, has 71,443 acres less than the 1950 allotment.

Will this shift bring about a need for additional foreign workers to be imported? Figures from the Department of Labor show that in 1952, the latest figures available for a complete year, one Western State imported 22,539 foreign workers, another 57,407, another 19,352.

In 1952, Missouri used 1,790 foreign workers.

Do the western growers need the acreage from the South and the East to provide employment for citizens of other countries?

For the answer to this question I now refer to a telegram received on January 8, last, by the Missouri Cotton Producers Association. This telegram is signed by a Mr. William H. Tolbert, chairman of a western labor users committee. It reads:

> Suggest joint resolution Senate and House Agriculture and Appropriations Committees to expand authority of Departments Labor and Justice to continue Mexican national supplementary labor program and supply of funds for activities for remainder fiscal year. California crops in jeopardy due inability to obtain workers now. Appreciate any influence brought on committees involved for affirmative action.

It is my understanding the old growers one time agreed to give up 157,500 acres with the expectation of more reasonable amendments to the current law. These amendments for the old growers are not in S. 2643, and if not inserted, either here or in conference, Missouri would face the same situation later in the year. Missouri cotton producers representatives have been here for days trying to have these amendments included.

Would it not be possible to insert these amendments in the bill; and thereby recognize the serious problems of the little farmers in the old cotton-growing States?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I am a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee has given this bill very long, careful, and painstaking consideration. It is not by any means a perfect bill; but I am in favor of the bill because I believe it is absolutely necessary to have some increase in acreage unless we are to impose tremendous hardships upon the farmers throughout the cotton-growing States?

I opposed some of the provisions of the bill in committee, but after full and detailed discussion on the part of the committee certain amendments were adopted and some others were defeated. Some of them relate to the mechanism of the bill. I think they could very well be taken care of in conference. The subject has been discussed by a number of Senators, who have already spoken to the effect that the conference is the proper place to make certain adjustments. However, I think we should disabuse the public mind of the notion that this is not a pretty good bill in most respects. The bill has so many features that will help the cotton-growing States that I do not think we could afford to jeopardize its passage by delaying methods or by undertaking to insert amendments which would be destructive of the context of the bill.

I think the committee has done a very good job. I believe that with the possibility of some changes being made in the mechanics of the bill in conference, we can go back to our people and say that this bill represents a distinct improvement over what we would have if we were to allow the present law to apply, with a restriction to 17,910,000 acres.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate bill 2643. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had thought that there was an amendment pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] was withdrawn.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make a statement preparatory to offering an amendment.

The bill as presently written would withdraw approximately 4 million acres of land from the production of cotton but would impose no limit upon the uses to which the 4 million acres of land thus withdrawn might be put.

We know quite well what will happen in the absence of any such limitation. The farmers will naturally be anxious to increase their incomes, and they will use the land for the production, in the main, of other crops. The result will be an increase in the planting and production of soybeans, as well as an increase in the production of soybean oil.

We shall also have an increase in the planting of vegetables, and we shall have an increased quantity of potatoes, lettuce, celery, tomatoes, and so forth. This last may be particularly the case in areas in the West where cotton is grown under irrigation. The acreage withdrawn from cotton will be diverted into other channels.

While we deal with the question of surpluses in cotton, we shall be increasing the problem of surpluses in other commodities. It seems to me that we should deal with this issue in this initial bill, and that we should provide that the acreage which is thus withdrawn shall be devoted to soil-conserving purposes, and employed in soil-conserving practices. In other words, alternative crops—at least cash crops—should not be planted on the land thus withdrawn, but instead there might be a planting of the nitrogen-fixing plants, the legumes, lespedeza, clover, and alfalfa, in particular, which are soil-building plants taking nitrogen out of the air and putting it into the soil. In many cases, also, this land might be used for pasturage purposes.

I know that if we produce more clover and alfalfa and pasture more cattle, that this will not be a complete withdrawal from use, because it will increase, directly and indirectly, the production of beef cattle and dairy products. But at least we shall be putting something back into the soil, instead of further taking valuable natural elements out of the soil. The entire problem will face us when we come to deal with other farm commodities—when we withdraw, if we do, 16 million acres of wheat land, and when we withdraw many million acres of corn land. The question will arise as to the alternative uses of these soils. If we do not make any attempt whatsoever to deal with this question, what we shall do will be to improve the position of the producers of the so-called basic crops, but worsen the condition of the producers of other crops.

It is in a sense, I think, somewhat shocking that we must deal with the problem of farm surpluses at all, in a world where there is still hunger. I hope very much that we can devise methods to get so-called surplus food products into the stomachs of hungry people, and surplus cotton on the backs of ill-clad people. We obviously now have the problem of what is called overproduction with respect to these commodities, and we are not helping the national interest when we transfer the problem from one crop to another. So,

I shall offer an amendment, as an addition to line 23 on page 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 23, it is proposed to add the following proviso:

Provided further, That acreage which is withdrawn from the cultivation of cotton in excess of 3 acres per farm shall not be devoted to the production of other cash crops but shall be used for soil-conserving practices such as the growing of legumes and other nitrogen-fixing plants, for the pasturing of cattle, and for other appropriate means.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wonder whether the Senator would be agreeable to adding wheat to his amendment. I believe that ought to be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing to have that principle carried out with respect to wheat and corn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Wheat should be added to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The pending bill deals with cotton. When we come to consider wheat and corn I shall be glad to offer such an amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator realize that the pending measure contains a wheat amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. We have already taken care of wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would suggest that we try first to obtain agreement on the amendment which I now offer.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Illinois add an amendment providing compensation to the farmer for thus putting his acreage into use and providing a cash income for him and his family, so that there will be adequate incentive to carry out the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe that it is necessary at present to give a bonus for that purpose. The use of the proposed practice will build up the soil in itself. We want the South to prosper. We want the position of the cotton grower to be protected. However, we are well aware of the fact that the great increase in the production of soybeans in the South will worsen the position of the Middle West. I am perfectly willing to apply the same principle when we come to a consideration of corn and wheat.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In order that the legislative history may be clear, will the Senator agree, after the word "cotton," to add the words "or wheat or corn"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to do so when we consider wheat and corn.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the conferees would understand the meaning of the amendment and would endeavor to work out the purpose of the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator says he will be glad to offer such an amendment when we consider wheat. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the pending bill is a wheat bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is only by a great stretch of the meaning of the bill that wheat has been tacked on. It is in the form of a vermiform appendix.

Mr. EASTLAND. Such an amendment would certainly be germane.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Obviously, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois would change the basic character of the pending bill. It raises some very vital questions which would adversely affect and would certainly have great repercussions upon those whose acreage would be taken out of production. It is not the type of amendment that should go into emergency legislation. A situation has arisen which needs quick attention. If the farmers are to obtain relief, they must get it quickly. I refer to the farmers in the South and in the West. In my opinion, an amendment of this kind would kill the legislation. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that the President of the United States in the message which was read to the Senate yesterday recommended that land which is withdrawn from cultivation should be devoted to soil-conservation practices? Is that not correct? I read from his message:

When land must be diverted from production it is essential that its use be related to the basic objectives of soil conservation—to protect and to improve that land.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct, but we have——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can hardly believe it possible that the majority leader should now be opposing on the floor of the Senate a proposal advanced only yesterday by the head of his own administration. It is extraordinary that it falls on the shoulders of Senators on this side of the aisle to take on the armor and do battle for the administration—against its own supposed leaders.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is trying to get a laugh. He knows that the proposal of the President of the United States related to a permanent farm program. We have before us a piece of emergency legislation designed to meet a critical situation in the South and in the West. It is a situation which, if we are to meet it at all, we must do it immediately. The amendment which the Senator offers, for the first time on the floor of the Senate today, has not had the consideration of the committee. It has far-reaching consequences. The Senator from Illinois knows as well as the majority leader this is not the type of amendment that should be added to the bill, and in my opinion, the effect of adding it to the bill would be to kill it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to point out that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois does not conform to the recommendations of the President. The recommendations of the President, as I recall them, were that when the land was taken out of cultivation from one crop and devoted to soil conservation practice, ACB payments should be made. I am sure he recommended payment. The Senator from Illinois is unalterably opposed to any payments being made, as I understand. Therefore, his amendment does not conform to the more liberal recommendations of the President of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Both the amendment of the Senator from Illinois and the proposal of the President of the United States will be given time to be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and by the Senate. Such an amendment does not belong on the pending bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the vote on the cotton-acreage bill there may be inserted in the RECORD messages and telegrams which I have received with reference to that measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The messages and telegrams presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

EAST GRAND FORKS, MINN.,
January 11, 1954.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building:

Strongly urge passage of Welker rider providing for use of section 32 funds for diversion of potatoes.

FARMERS CO-OP POTATO MARKETING ASSOCIATION,
HERMAN SKYBERG, *President.*
T. P. FREDRICKSON, *Manager.*

PALATINE, ILL., *January 8, 1954.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Macaroni and noodle industry is faced with critical shortage of durum wheat raised in a small section of North and South Dakota and Minnesota. We urge your support of the amendment removing durum acreage allotments in Senate bill 2643 in the best interests of the growers, processors, and consuming public.

ROBERT M. GREEN,
Secretary, National Macaroni Manufacturers Association.

JANUARY 11, 1954.

ROBERT M. GREEN,
Secretary, National Macaroni Manufacturers Association, Palatine, Ill.:

You can count on my support for efforts to exempt durum from acreage allotments. Letter follows.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 8, 1954.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The durum milling industry is faced with a critical shortage of durum wheat. Our normal durum grind is 24 to 26 million bushels annually. Production of millable durum this year was less than half that amount. Carryover from previous crops was very small. There will be no carryover to next crop.

The semolina and durum flours ground from durum wheat are required by the manufacturers of macaroni, spaghetti, and noodles for the manufacture of high quality products. An adequate supply of durum wheat is necessary to maintain the quality of these important foods, and to permit consumers to purchase them at reasonable prices.

Milling durum is a highly specialized crop. It is produced only in a small territory in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. The macaroni industry and the American consumer are entirely dependent upon the farmers of that small area for durum supplies. Since durum wheat is in critically short supply rather than in a surplus position, durum acreage in the durum territory should be excluded from the acreage allotment program. We urge in the interest of consumers, producers, and processors that you support the section in Senate bill 2643 dealing with durum acreage allotments.

JULE M. WABER,
Chairman, Durum Committee, Millers National Federation.

JANUARY 12, 1954.

JULE M. WABER,
Chairman, Durum Committee, Amber Milling Division, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.:

You can count on my support for efforts to exempt durum from acreage allotments. Letter follows.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. AIKEN. After the bill has been read a third time, I propose to move to substitute the wording of the Senate bill for the language contained in H. R. 6665. I do not want the bill to be passed before that is done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6665.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the title be amended so as to read:

An act to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. WELKER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. CLEMENTS conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2643 will be indefinitely postponed.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 442, Senate bill 2150.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2150) providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say for the information of the Senate that what I have in mind is to bring up the bill for consideration and make it the unfinished business. I would not propose at this hour that the Senate proceed with debate on the measure.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have discussed the matter with 1 Senator who desires to make more than 2 speeches, but not at length, if the parliamentary situation is such that he may make 2 brief speeches. For that reason, I wish the Senator from California would not make his motion at this time but wait until I can further discuss the question. We should like to make it possible for one of the Senators to make more speeches than he would ordinarily make under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am merely trying to expedite the business of the Senate. For over a week I have given advance notice that we would take up these bills in orderly sequence. There was no attempt to bring them up without prior notice to the Senate. Under the circumstances, we should have unfinished business before the Senate. The orderly procedure would be to bring the bills up, and a Senator could submit a request to make six speeches if he so desired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate I should like to say that I have just had a discussion with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Maryland for whom the Senator from Louisiana had spoken, and it is agreeable to them, as I understand, that the quorum call be dispensed with and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2150, with the understanding that the debate will proceed tomorrow.

I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 442, Senate bill 2150, providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, House bill 1917, which is the only one of the three coinage bills which has not been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1917) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have a series of amendments at the desk which I desire to call up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, to strike out all in lines 7 through 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Such coins shall be disposed of at par by banks or trust companies selected

by the Louisiana Purchase One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Association, or the Missouri Historical Society."

On page 2, line 24, to strike out "1953" and insert in lieu thereof "1954."

On page 3, beginning with the semicolon in line 16, to strike out all through the word "sesquicentennial" in line 19 and add a period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this bill authorizes the coinage of a certain number of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase. There have been celebrations in States which were originally a part of the Louisiana Purchase territory. The President of the United States participated in these celebrations, as did the Ambassador from France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS REFERRED

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow, but I shall be glad to withhold my motion if there be any further business to be transacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate certain nominations, which will be referred to the appropriate committees.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 13, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 12 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Vernon Woods, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Carl J. Werner, resigned.

George M. Glasser, of New York, to be United States marshal for the western district of New York, vice Raymond A. Morgan whose term has expired.

Emmett Mitchell Smith, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas, vice Clifton C. Carter whose term has expired.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our shelter from life's stormy blasts and our eternal home: We come with confidence, not in our feeble hold of Thee but in Thy mighty grasp of us as we trust the love that will not let us go. Gird, we beseech Thee, with a strength and power which is not their own Thy servants in the ministry of public affairs, who, in this temple of the people's hope, give their consent to enactments expressing the inflexible creed that human tyranny is an offense to the Creator and that by divine decree mankind everywhere is crowned with infinite worth and dignity, the right to abundant life and abounding freedom.

We humbly pray that Thou wilt use us in these decisive days as Thy instrument to bring to naught the evil schemes of all who, at home and abroad, deny the fundamental faith which flames in splendor at the heart of a democracy which shall at last redeem all the sons of men and make them the sons of God.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 12, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FREAR was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow, Thursday, January 14, 1954, in order to attend to official business in the State of Delaware.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MALONE, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to hold a hearing beginning at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

On request of Mr. MCCARTHY, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday next.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the insertion of matters in the RECORD, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McCarran
Anderson	Hayden	McCarthy
Barrett	Hennings	McClellan
Beall	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bennett	Hill	Monroney
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Burke	Holland	Mundt
Bush	Humphrey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Payne
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smathers
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Upton
Frear	Lennon	Watkins
Fulbright	Long	Welker
George	Magnuson	Wiley
Gillette	Malone	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	Young
Gore	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the Vice President, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.